

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

HAZELTON SPENCER

RAYMOND D HAVENS

C S. SINGLETON

KEMP MALONE

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

DON CAMERON ALLEN

VOLUME LIX

1944

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1944

TO THE MEMORY OF

HAZELTON SPENCER

1893-1944

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

1937-1944

CO-EDITOR OF MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

1930-1944

HAZELTON SPENCER

July 7, 1893–July 28, 1944

"Blessed is he," wrote Carlyle, "who has found his work; let him ask no other blessedness." Professor Spencer found his work and was happy in it. He accepted the limitations and difficulties it imposed, for he was not used to complain. He delighted in the drama and pitied those who worked in other fields, he enjoyed his teaching and was an excellent, illuminating teacher, he threw himself wholeheartedly into research and was a keen, able, discriminating, and accurate scholar, he found pleasure in administration and was an unusually capable, thorough chairman of the department and member of important committees, he found satisfaction in giving careful, discriminating attention to the editing of *Modern Language Notes*. He worked hard, publishing five books as well as numerous articles and reviews, carrying considerable administrative work, and teaching almost continuously from the time he received his bachelor's degree at Boston University in 1915. He was an assistant at Harvard in 1921-3, assistant professor at Minnesota in 1923-4, associate professor, professor, and chairman of his department at the State College of Washington from 1924 to 1928, and associate professor and professor at Johns Hopkins since 1928. From 1936 to 1942 he was chairman of the English Department at Johns Hopkins. He also taught in the summer sessions at the University of Iowa, at Harvard, Duke, Northwestern, Hopkins, and the Bread Loaf School. His books are: *Shakespeare Improved* (1927), *Selected Poems of Vachel Lindsay* (ed., 1931), *Shakespeare's Richard III* (ed., 1933), *Elizabethan Plays* (ed., 1933), *The Art and Life of William Shakespeare* (1940). At the time of his death he had nearly completed an extensive anthology of English literature. He enjoyed this work and did it with characteristic thoroughness and independence, reading very widely in the authors themselves and in the critical and biographical studies devoted to them.

Professor Spencer was a pleasant person to work with: frank and

friendly, blest with a hearty sense of humor, receiving and giving criticism freely and without rancour, he was keenly interested in the welfare of the department and its students as well as a stout upholder of its traditions of democratic administration. Despite romantic sympathies—his favorite authors outside the drama were the romantic poets—he was a sturdy realist. He faced the facts and thought for himself, in literature, in the arts, in politics, in religion, and what he thought he said. Thoroughly honest, decided in his opinions, vigorous and virile, he accepted the world as he found it, and he found it good.

R. D. H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME LIX

	PAGE
Smith, Roland M, Spenser's "Stony Aubrian"	1
Buhler, C F, Notes on the Plimpton Manuscript of the <i>Court of Sapience</i>	5
Wieruszowski, Helene, The Rise of the Catalan Language in the 13th Century	9
Kurrelmeyer, W, <i>Fackten, Fischfackten, Floßfackten</i> , and Similar Words	21
Walz, J A, Pythonissa <i>Faust II</i> , L 9135	26
Selmer, Carl, An Unpublished MHG Version of Pseudo-Aristotelian Proverbs	31
Havens, G R, The Chronology of Diderot's Journey to Langres in 1759	33
Schinz, Albert, Victor Hugo et Dehille	37
Meroney, Howard, Two Old English Textual Errors	40
Livingston, C H, English <i>Sheer</i> (off)	42
Stillwell, G, Webb, H J., Chaucer's Knight and the Hundred Years' War	45
Pratt, R A, Was Robyn the Miller's Youth Misspent?	47
Berry, E G., Clichés and Their Sources	50
Gohdes, Clarence, Melville's Friend "Toby"	52
Sealts, M. M., The Publication of Melville's <i>Piazza Tales</i>	56
Coad, O S, The Meaning of Poe's "Eldorado"	59
Davis, Edwin B, Latin <i>-ct</i> > Old French <i>it</i>	75
Spitzer, Leo, The Farcical Elements in <i>Inferno</i> , Cantos XXI-XXIII	83
Singleton, C. S. and Spitzer, Leo, <i>Decameron VIII</i> , 9. <i>carapignare</i>	88
Frank, Grace, <i>Biaus Nés</i>	92
Mautner, F. H, <i>Nazi und Sozi</i>	93
Spitzer, Leo, Wienerisch <i>Remassurr</i>	100
Naumann, Walter, <i>Christinas Heimreise</i> und ihr Vorbild	104
Menner, Robert J, Two Old English Words	106
Mezger, Fritz, <i>On Fæder Feorme</i> , <i>Beowulf</i> , Line 21	113
Stein, Arnold, Stanza Continuity in <i>The Faerie Queene</i>	114
Haight, G. S., The Author of "The Address," in Quarles's <i>Shepherds Oracles</i>	118
Babb, Lawrence, Hamlet, Melancholy, and the Devil	120
Maxwell, Baldwin, The Source of the Principal Plot of <i>The Fair Maid of the Inn</i>	122
Harbage, Alfred, Materials for the Study of English Renaissance drama	128
Paulsen, Wolfgang, Zum Problem der Novelle bei Kleist	149
Meroney, Howard, The Nine Herbs	157
Brooke, Tucker, Shakespeare's Dove-House	160
Webb, Henry J., Falstaff's Clothes	162

	PAGE
Moore, John Robert, Sheridan's "Little Bronze Pliny"	164
Hudson, Richard B., Meredith's <i>The Egoist</i> as a Play	165
Metzdorf, Robert F., A New Wordsworth Letter	168
Purcell, J. M., Rime in <i>Paradise Lost</i> ✓	171
Glasheen, Adaline E., Shelley's First Published Review of <i>Mandeville</i>	172
Templeman, William D., A Note on Arnold's "Civilization in the United States"	173
Sturtevant, A. M., Regarding the Prefix <i>ǵ-</i> in Old Norse <i>ǵ miss</i> , 'vicissim'	175
Magoun, F. P., Jr., <i>Hymselfen lak a Pilgrim to Desseigne Troilus</i> , V, 157	176
Loomis, R. S., Chaucer's Eight Years' Sickness	178
Jeremy, Sister Mary, O. P., The English Prose Translation of <i>Legenda Aurea</i>	181
Spitzer, Leo, Anglo-French Etymologies	223
Knapp, Lewis M., Smollett and the Elder Pitt	250
Stearns, M. W., A Note on Robert Henryson's Allusions to Religion and Law	257
Stearns, M. W., Robert Henryson and the Leper Crossed	265
Coffman, G. R., Canon's Yeoman's Prologue, G, LL 563-566 Horse or Man	269
Coffman, G. R., Another Analogue for the Violation of the Maiden in the "Wife of Bath's Tale"	271
Nitchie, Elizabeth, Variant Readings in Three of Shelley's Poems	274
Fess, G. M., Personal Sources for Maupassant's <i>Contes</i>	277
Bentley, Norma E., A Grant to 'Hudibras' Butler	281
Saintonge, Paul and Christ, R. W., Omissions and Additions to <i>Fifty Years of Molière Studies</i>	282
Seyrig, Henri, Une Réminiscence latine de Jean-Louis Guéz de Balzac	285
Brown, J. J., Samuel Johnson "Making Aether"	286
Parrott, T. M., Mak and Archie Armstrong	297
Walcutt, C. C., The Fire Symbolism in <i>Moby Dick</i>	304
Weatherly, E. H., Beau Tibbs and Colonel Sellers	310
Gibbens, V. E., A Note on Three Lyrics of Philip Freneau	313
Deen, F. H., The Genesis of <i>Martin Faber</i> in <i>Caleb Williams</i>	315
Manning, C. A., The Double of Dostoyevsky	317
Kurrelmeyer, W., Einzel = einzal	321
Krappe, A. H., The Historical Background of Philippe de Thaün's <i>Bestiaire</i>	325
Pearce, Josephine A., An Early Talbot Epitaph	327
Havens, R. D., Parnell's "Hymn to Contentment"	329
Thompson, D. W., Keats's "To the Nile"	331
Seely, F. F., A Footnote to <i>The Road to Xanadu</i>	333
Aubin, R. A., <i>Tourist</i>	334
Glasheen, F. J., An Early Quotation from Shelley	335
Atkins, Stuart, The American Language	335
Feise, Ernst, Gotthilf Heinrich Schubert und Goethes "Selige Sehnsucht"	369

CONTENTS

IX

	PAGE
Kurrelmeyer, W, <i>Hangematte</i>	374
Schnokauer, Arno, Der Begriff "Deutschland" im Wörterbuch des Dasypodius	378
Zeydel, E H, Knowledge of Hrotsvitha's Works Prior to 1500	382
Naumann, Walter, Die Quelle von Hofmannsthals <i>Frau ohne Schatten</i>	385
Lynes, Carlos, Jr, A Defense of the "Récit de Thérémène"	387
Lancaster, H C, <i>Situation</i> as a Term of Literary Criticism	392
Feuilleiat, Albert, Sur une lettre de Baudelaire	395
Stein, Arnold, Sonnet Structure in Chapman's Blank Verse	397
Pearce, R H, Sterne and Sensibility in American Diaries	403
Kliger, Samuel, God's "Plenitude" in the Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins	408
Haines, L F, Mill and <i>Pauline</i> the 'Review' That 'Retarded' Browning's Fame	410
Hankins, J E, Spenser's <i>Lucifera</i> and <i>Philotime</i>	413
Gegenheimer, A F., A Note on the Formation of Preterit-Present Verbs	415
Hillmann, Sister Mary Vincent, <i>Pearl Lere Leke</i> , 210	417
Richeson, A W, Notes on Some Physical Terms in the <i>NED</i> Corrigenda	419
Krappe, A H, Antipodes	441
Dabney, L E, An Anonymous Sixteenth Century French Play on the Death of Lucretia	448
Spitzer, Leo, <i>Comme quoi</i>	454
Eoff, Sherman, A Phase of Pereda's Writings in Imitation of Balzac	460
Austin, H D, Beatrice's Eyes	466
Austin, H. D., "Sounding Brass"	468
Lievsay, J L, An Immediate Source for <i>Faerie Queene</i> , Bk V, <i>Proem</i>	469
Smith, R M, More Irish Words in Spenser	472
Allen, R B, <i>Wad</i>	478
Moore, A K, Alysoun's Other Tonne	481
Levi Della Vida, G, "Chrestiens de la sainture"	484
Levy, Raphael, <i>La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket</i> , vers 4941	487
Ham, E B, Readings from <i>Parise la Duchesse</i>	490
Allen, D C, George Herbert's <i>Sycomore</i>	493
Manning, C A, Shevchenko and Pushkin's <i>To the Slanderers of Russia</i>	495
Hatcher, Anna G, Bahuvrīhi in Sears-Roebuck	515
Frank, Grace, Jaufré Rudel, Casella and Spitzer	526
Parker, W R, John Milton, Servener, 1590-1632	532
Allen, D C, Milton's Winged Serpents	537
Ward, W S, Shelley and the Reviewers Once More	539
Jones, F L, Shelley's Revised Will	542
Kaderly, N L., The Stoppage of Shelley's Income in 1821	545
Ward, W. S, Byron's <i>Hours of Idleness</i> and Other than Scotch Reviewers	547
Moore, J. R., Scott's <i>Antiquary</i> and Defoe's <i>History of Apparitions</i>	550
Logan, Sister Eugenia, An Indebtedness of Coleridge to Crashaw	551

	PAGE
Cook, Viola, Browning's "Parley" and de Lassay's "Mémoire"	553
Fuerst, Norbert, A Silly Sonnet to Oipheus	556
Nitze, W. A., Count Philip's Book and the <i>Graal</i>	559
Delattre, Pierre, A Contribution to the History of "1 glassey"	562
Spitzer, Leo, <i>Nincompoop</i>	565
Dahlström, C. E. W. L., Strindberg's <i>Fadren</i> and the Théâtre Libre	567
Atkinson, Dorothy F., Some Further Chaucer Allusions	568
Greene, C. R., A Note on the Authorship of <i>Shamela</i>	571
Briggs, H. E., A Note on Keats and Addison	572

REVIEWS

Einar Haugen, Norwegian Word Studies [Stefán Einarsson]	61
H. A. Fausset, Walt Whitman [C. J. Furness]	64
K. C. Balderston (ed.), Thraliana. The Diary of Miss Hester Lynch Thrale, 1776-1809 [R. L. Greene]	67
Rae Blanchard (ed.), The Correspondence of Richard Steele [Walter Graham]	69
M. D. Legge (ed.), Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions from All Souls Ms 182 [Sidney Painter]	70
T. M. Parrott and R. H. Ball, A Short View of Elizabethan Drama; M. M. Bhattacharjee, "Courtesy" in Shakespeare, O. J. Campbell, Shakespeare's Satire, T. W. Baldwin, William Shakespeare's Petty School [Hardin Craig]	133
P. B. Gove, The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction; W. R. Irwin, The Making of "Jonathan Wild", G. H. Maynardier, The First American Novelist?, F. M. A. Hilbish, Charlotte Smith, Poet and Novelist (1749-1806). [Ernest Bernbaum.]	137
W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare [M. A. Shaaber]	139
R. E. Bennett (ed.), The Complete Poems of John Donne. [R. B. Botting.]	141
D. M. Wolfe, Milton in the Puritan Revolution [Wallace Notestein]	142
T. C. Izard, George Whetstone. Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters. [J. A. Gee.]	143
F. H. Lyell, A Study of the Novels of John Galt. [B. A. Booth.]	145
H. W. Starr, Gray as a Literary Critic [W. P. Jones]	146
H. M. Smyser and F. P. Magoun, Jr. (trs.), Survivals in Old Norwegian of Medieval English, French and German Literature [F. Meeger.]	147
Caroline Brady, The Legends of Ermanaric. [Kemp Malone.]	188
Ruth B. McJimsey, Chaucer's Irregular -e [H. E. Patch.]	188
Sister Mary O'Connor, The Art of Dying Well. [Harry Caplan]	191
Grace E. Moore, The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor [C. G. Loomis.]	193
C. W. Kennedy, The Earliest English Poetry. [Kemp Malone.]	194

CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
Alfred Hart, <i>Stolne and Surreptitious Copies, a Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos</i> [Leo Kirschbaum]	196
J C Adams, <i>The Globe Playhouse Its Design and Equipment</i> [F R Johnson]	198
C E Ward (ed.), <i>The Letters of John Dryden, J R Moore, Defoe's Sources for Robert Drury's Journal</i> [Rae Blanchard]	200
J Butt and G Tillotson (eds), <i>The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope</i> [L I Bredvold]	202
Jean Robertson, <i>The Art of Letter Writing</i> [Ruth Kelso]	203
✓ C S Lewis, <i>A Preface to Paradise Lost</i> , R W Chambers, Poets and Their Critics Langland and Milton [W R Parker]	205
R A Aubin (ed.), <i>London in Flames, London in Glory</i> [W H Irving]	206
L L Martz, <i>The Later Career of Tobias Smollett</i> [C E Jones]	208
J Boyd, <i>Goethe's Iphigene auf Tauris</i> [Victor Lange]	209
F. A. von Hayek (ed.), <i>The Spirit of the Age</i> , by John Stuart Mill [W. S. Knickerbocker]	210
S A. Larrabee, <i>English Bards and Grecian Marbles</i> [B H Stern.]	211
V E Hull and Archer Taylor, <i>A Collection of Welsh Riddles</i> [Richard Jente]	213
W. V. Moody, R M Lovett, and F B Millett, <i>A History of English Literature, E. Wagenknecht, Cavalcade of the English Novel.</i> [Robert Shafer]	287
H N Fairchild, <i>Religious Trends in English Poetry, Vol II</i> [Ricardo Quintana]	290
L R. Lind (ed.), <i>The Vita Sancti Malchi of Reginald of Canterbury</i> [P F Jones.]	292
E C. Mossner, <i>The Forgotten Hume. Le Bon David</i> [F A Pottle]	294
C. G. Osgood, H. G. Lottspeich, D E Mason (eds), <i>The Works of Edmund Spenser. The Minor Poems, Vol. I</i> [J W Bennett.]	336
Sir Israel Gollancz, Mabel Day, M. S. Serjeantson (eds), <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.</i> [Henry Savage.]	342
George Sampson, <i>The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature</i> [Robert Shafer]	350
E. N. Hooker (ed.), <i>The Critical Works of John Dennis</i> [L I. Bredvold]	354
L. B. Wright, <i>Religion and Empire, 1558-1625</i> [H. W. Sams]	356
Adrien Bonjour, <i>Coleridge's 'Hymn before Sunrise.'</i> [A. H. Nethercott]	358
Leon Howard, <i>The Connecticut Wits</i> [L M Miner]	359
Emma Detli, <i>Margaret Fuller Ossoli e i suoi corrispondenti</i> [A Lupari and S T. Williams]	361
W D Paden, <i>Tennyson in Egypt</i> [F D Cooley]	362
L. Hartley, <i>This is Lorence, a Narrative of the Reverend Laurence Sterne</i> [W B C Watkins]	363
G. H. Gerould, <i>The Patterns of English and American Fiction.</i> [Ernest Bernbaum]	364
Aaron Schaffer, <i>The Genres of Parnassian Poetry</i> [Henri Peyre]	420

	PAGE
R K Alspach, Irish Poetry from the English Invasion to 1798 [<i>R M Smith</i>]	422
G W Meyer, Wordsworth's Formative Years [<i>J Q Wolf, Jr</i>]	424
T H V Motter (ed), The Writings of Arthur Hallam [<i>H F Lowry</i>]	426
William Ringler, Stephen Gosson [<i>Kathrine Koller</i>]	427
E J Howard (ed), <i>Pleasant Quippes for Upstart Newfangled Gentle women</i> , A Esdaile (ed), Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association [<i>Kathrine Koller</i>]	428
Halldór Hermannsson, Bibliographic Notes [<i>L M Hollander</i>]	430
A J. Salvan, Zola aux Etats-Unis [<i>R J Niess</i>]	431
J J Arrom, Historia de la literatura dramática cubana [<i>D F Brown</i>]	432
Ernest Marchand, Frank Norris [<i>W E Martin, Jr</i>]	434
Warren Staebler, The Liberal Mind of John Morley [<i>E M. Everett</i>]	435
E V K Dobbie (ed), The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems [<i>F P Maqoun, Jr.</i>]	497
R. E Clark and L Poston, Jr, French Syntax List. [<i>Anna G. Hatcher</i>]	502
K R Wallace, Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric [<i>F R Johnson</i>]	505
C O Williams, Thralldom in Ancient Iceland. [<i>L M Hollander</i>]	507
S. L. Sumberg, The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival [<i>Carl Selmer.</i>]	508
J A. Hiller, Albrecht von Eyb, Medieval Moralist [<i>Carl Selmer.</i>]	509
G R Kernodle, From Art to Theatre Form and Convention in the Renaissance [<i>H C Lancaster.</i>]	572
J. H. Whitfield, Petrarch and the Renaissance [<i>C S. Singleton.</i>]	574
J. S Kenyon and T A Knott, A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English [<i>Stefán Einarsson.</i>]	575
M. M. Ross, Milton's Royalism. A Study of the Conflict of Symbol and Idea in the Poems [<i>Maurice Kelley</i>]	578
I W. U. Chase (ed), Horace Walpole Gardenist An Edition of Walpole's <i>The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening.</i> [<i>Katherine McNamara.</i>]	579
J. C. Corson, A Bibliography of Sir Walter Scott. [<i>F. A. Pottle.</i>]	580
R T Fitzhugh and Delancey Ferguson (eds), Robert Burns His Associates and Contemporaries [<i>David Daiches.</i>]	581

BRIEF MENTION

M. J. Quinlan, Victorian Prelude, a History of English Manners, 1700-1830 [<i>R O Bald.</i>]	71
L. C. Jones, The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes. [<i>W. H. Irving.</i>]	148
J. Q. Adams (ed.), <i>Oenone and Paris</i> , by T. H. (1594). [<i>Douglas Bush.</i>]	214

CONTENTS

xiii

	PAGE
Lane Cooper (tr), Plato on the Trial and Death of Socrates [<i>Richmond Lattimore</i>]	215
B H Bronson, J R Caldwell, W H Durham, B H Lehman, Gordon McKenzie, and J F Ross, Studies in the Comic [<i>Ernest Bern- baum</i>]	215
H B Hagstotz, The Educational Theories of John Ruskin [<i>W H Dunn</i>]	216
E J. Howard and G D Wilson (eds), <i>The Canterbury Tales</i> by Geoffrey Chaucer [<i>H R Patch</i>]	217
G Cohen (ed), S A Ives (tr), Geoffrey Tory and Catherine de Medici [<i>H C Lancaster</i>]	218
Boies Penrose, Urbane Travelers, 1591-1635 [<i>R B Botting</i>]	218
G C D Odell, Annals of the New York Stage, XIII (1885-1888) [<i>N B. Fagin</i>]	219
S B Wells (ed), A Comparison between the Two Stages A Late Restoration Book of the Theatre [<i>Hazelton Spencer</i>]	219
Douglas Bush (ed), Selected Poems of Sir William Davenant [<i>D C Allen</i>]	220
Lane Cooper, Experiments in Education [<i>D C Allen</i>]	220
R W. Chapman (ed), Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, XXVIII (1942) [<i>R D Havens</i>]	295
G. P. Jackson (ed), Down-East Spirituals and Others. [<i>W. R Mackenzie</i>]	365
E J Simmons, An Outline of Modern Russian Literature (1880-1940) [<i>O. A. Manning</i>]	366
Sister M. J. Schroeder, Mary-Verse in Meistergesang [<i>Carl Selmer</i>]	367
H. W. Howe, Gieta Hall [<i>Kenneth Curry</i>]	436
C. F. Harrold (ed), A Newman Treasury Selections from the Prose Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman [<i>H C Mossner</i>]	437
Basil Willey, The Seventeenth Century Background [<i>D C Allen</i>]	437
Emile Cailliet, The Clue to Pascal Foreword by J A Mackay [<i>H C. Lancaster</i>]	438
The Canadian Modern Language Review [<i>H C Lancaster.</i>]	510
A C. Ward, A Literary Journey through Wartime Britain [<i>J L. Clifford.</i>]	511
Gustave Cohen, La Grande Clarté du Moyen-Age. [<i>Grace Frank</i>].	583
Giacomo Grillo, Poets at the Court of Ferrara [<i>C. S Singleton</i>]	584

CORRESPONDENCE

S. J. Herben, The Run Again	72
Arno Schirokauer, Noch einmal. "Wes das Herz voll ist"	221
A G. Mitchell, Worth Both His Ears	222
T. O. Mabbott, Grete's Bad Name Again	368
Howard Roman, The Last New Volumes of Rilke's Letters	438
C. G. Osgood, Variorum Spenser, Minor Poems	511

	PAGE
A J Ansen, Some Notes on Otfrid's <i>Ad Luibertum</i>	513
Carlos Lynes, Jr, The "Récit de Théciamène" Once More	584
E H Sehrt, The Etymology of German <i>schcunst</i>	586

NECROLOGY

Hazelton Spencer [<i>R D Havens</i>]	v
E C Armstrong [<i>H C Lancaster</i>]	296

Errata	586
--------	-----

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

JANUARY, 1944

Number 1

SPENSER'S "STONY AUBRIAN"

Of Spenser's Irish rivers only one remains unidentified. It appears in the second line of his catalogue:

There was the Liffy rolling downe the lea,
The sandy Slane, the stony Aubrian¹

Joyce, after proposing the division of *Aubrian* into *au* (Ir. *abh*, "river") and *brian* and noting the place it occupies in Spenser's list, assumed that "it is somewhere in South Munster, and that it is itself a considerable river."² He concludes: "'The stony Aubrian' is a mystery, and, so far as I am concerned, will, I fear, remain so."

Since Joyce wrote, many identifications, all of them unsatisfactory, have been suggested: the Owenbrin in the Joyce Country,³ the Breanach between Cork and Kerry,⁴ the Urrip in Wexford,⁵ as well as Waterford Harbor and the Bray-Dargle.⁶

¹ *Faerie Queene*, Book IV, Canto xi 41, 1-2

² P. W. Joyce, "Spenser's Irish Rivers," *Fraser's Magazine*, xcvi (1878), 325; reprinted in *The Wonders of Ireland* (1911), p. 93

³ C. L. Falkiner, "Spenser in Ireland," *Edinburgh Review*, cci (1905), 179, note. The Owenbrin (*Abhainn Brian*) is a very small river and cannot be considered for etymological reasons, as *Brian* could not become Spenser's dissyllabic *brian*. Jenkins supports this identification in *PMLA*, lxx (1938), 361, but offers no convincing evidence.

⁴ T. A. Rahilly, "Identification of the . . . Aubrian . . .," *Journal of Cork Hist. and Arch. Soc.*, 2nd ser., xxii (1916), 49-56. Again, the Breanach is insignificant as a river.

⁵ W. H. Grattan Flood, *ibid.* The objections to this identification are listed by Miss Henley.

⁶ Pauline Henley proposed Waterford Harbor in her *Spenser in Ireland* (1928), p. 93. That Miss Henley's suggestion is a desperate guess is evident from her note and from her later identification of the Aubrian with the Bray-Dargle (*London Times Literary Supplement*, Nov. 28, 1936).

While Joyce could find no river name like "Aubrian," he unknowingly proposed the right approach. In commenting on the first river in the catalogue, the Liffey "rolling downe the lea," he associated "the lea" with "the old plain of Moy-Lifè, celebrated in ancient Irish writings"⁷ In a very old place-name poem on *Mag Life*, "Plain of Liffey,"⁸ the opening stanza states that "Liffey the bright" got her name from the plain through which she flows. In the absence of the name Aubrian for Spenser's river, can we identify the river from the name of the plain it flows through? The search is an easy one, for legends relating to *Mag Bregain*, "the Plain of Bregan" (later *Moy-bregban* or *Moy-brian*), are quite as numerous as those connected with the Liffey.

Mag Bregain is the ancient name for the plain in southwestern County Tipperary which extends from Knockgrafton on the Suir westward to Emly and into County Limerick, roughly contemporaneous with the modern baronies of Clanwilliam. Its early inhabitants were the Muscraigi de Maig Bregain, or the Muscraigi Chuire (later Muskery Quirk), in it "along the flanks of the Galtees" lived the Etharlaigi, a little-known tribe.⁹ Its Milesian background is to be seen in numerous stories, including the *Dindshenchas* of *Glenn Breogain*, which explains the name *Bregan* as Milesian,¹⁰ and that of the two followers of Eber son of Míl, who fell at the hands of Eremon in the battle of Breoghan (Cath Breoghain) in *Mag Femen*.¹¹ Its later history need not detain us long.¹² Suffice

In spite of her discovery that the "Water of Bray" was once called (in an early Latin document) the Water of Brien because it flowed through the *Uí Briúin Cualann*, this identification has little more to recommend it. As the Dargle is not in South Munster, it fails to satisfy Miss Henley's earlier condition that the Aubrian be "somewhere in the southeastern area, as it is mentioned in the same line as the Slaney" (*Spenser in Ireland*, p. 93). Hogan, *Onomasticon Goedelicum*, pp. 662-63, lists seventeen separate localities named *Uí Briúin*.

⁷ Joyce, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

⁸ Edward Gwynn, *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, II (Dublin, 1906), 60. "It is to be noted that Life is properly the name of the plain. . . . The river is usually called *aba Life*" (p. 104). *Moy*, as in *Moy-Lifè*, is a later form of Old-Irish *mag*, "plain."

⁹ Westropp, "Dun Crot on the Galtees," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, XXXV (1920), 378.

¹⁰ Gwynn, *Metrical Dindshenchas*, IV (1924), 302.

¹¹ Keating, *History of Ireland* (Irish Texts Soc. ed.), II, 106-7; see Dinneen's note (IV, 313) on *Freamhann*.

¹² For numerous references, see E. Hogan, *Onomasticon Goedelicum*, s. v.

it to say that after the great Brian Boru (Boromhe) strengthened its fortifications about 1000 A.D., it was held for centuries by his descendants the O'Briens and was "virtually O'Brien land down to 1578."¹³

Spenser's interest in Mag Bregain is readily explained. For the river which flowed through Mag Bregain was none other than his own Arlo,¹⁴ which had its source in the north side of the Galtees not far from the source of his "Molanna"¹⁵ on the western slope of Galtymore—Spenser's Arlo Hill, the "highest head" of his "old father Mole." The beauty of the Glen of Aherlow has frequently been pointed out¹⁶ It was Spenser's good fortune—and ours—that his Irish surroundings were capable of heightening the descriptive power of the *Faerie Queene*.

In Spenser's time, although Aherlow was the recognized name for the region, the older names still survived. A letter to Queen Elizabeth in 1576 announces Sir Donnell O'Brien's surrender of "the castle of Moyebreghan,"¹⁷ and as late as 1600 Carew writes. "By consent *Harrowe* and *Muskeryquerck* were left to me, which I think I have sufficiently harassed."¹⁸

Much, however, as Spenser was attracted by the charm of the wooded ranges of Kylemore (*Coill Mór*, the Great Wood) and

Mag Bregain, Muscrige Breogain, Mag Iarthair Feumhin, Glenn mBreogain; J. O'Donovan, *Leabhar na gCeart: the Book of Rights* (1847), p. 45 note; Westropp, *Proc. R. I. A.* xxxiii, 444-92, xxxv, 378-84

¹³ Westropp, "Dun Ciot," *op. cit.*, p. 379. Two years later (in 1580) when Spenser arrived in Ireland as secretary to Lord Grey, the Desmond rebellion was being "suppressed."

¹⁴ Flynn, *The Book of the Galtees* (Dublin, 1926), p. 21: "*Eatherlach* was the old Irish name of the place. That was corrupted into Natherlach (from *na Eatherlach*) by the early English invaders. Later it became Aherlow in a dozen forms, including Spenser's 'Arlo'." See Hogan, *Onomasticon*, s. v. *Etharlach*, Glenn *Eatharlaigh*

¹⁵ See my article in *PMLA.*, L (1935), 1048-9

¹⁶ See Flynn, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3; Westropp, *Proc. R. I. A.* xxxiii, 478-9; xxxv, 380-81. As for the river itself "The river of Aherloe beginneth in the red bog of Ballybrien . . . and runs through Ballyaskane, between the manor of Donnegrot . . . and the lands of Ballylondrie . . . and thence, through Galbally, towards County Tipperary" (Fiants Eliz, 3317, 5932).

¹⁷ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1574-85, p. 37.

¹⁸ Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, 1589-1600, p. 494

Arlo,¹⁹ they constituted a perpetual menace to his security. They sheltered the rebellious Desmonds and O'Briens of his day. Hence his hope expressed in the *View*²⁰ that Aherlow might be garrisoned by the English "Moreover on this side of Arlo, neere to Moscrie Whirke, . . . I would have 200 more to be garrisoned, which should scoure both the White Knights countrey²¹ and Arlo, and Moscrie Whirke, by which places all the passages of theeves²² doe lye, which conuaye theyie stealthes from all Mounster downwarde towards Tipparye"

There can no longer be any doubt concerning the identity of Spenser's "stony Aubrian." The Galtee range is known to geologists for its "old red sandstone, which rises up from under the limestone of Mitchelstown Valley."²³ The stream is particularly "stony" near its source in the Galtees, where it is nearest to Kilcolman. If Spenser chose to call it by a name which would baffle later generations, there is ample evidence for such a practice elsewhere in his poetry²⁴; perhaps where he had already applied the name *Arlo* to Galtymore and to the Glen of Aherlow, he merely wanted to avoid confusion. It would be difficult to prove that he would have explained the *-brian* through the Milesian story of Bregan,²⁵ but that would not be necessary: he was painfully aware of the existence of many living Brians, MacBrians, and O'Briens,²⁶

¹⁹ Kylemore was immediately to the north of Kilcolman. Fitzmaurice could "attack Kilmallock from the fastness of Kylemore, the Great Wood, which was almost a continuation of the Aherlow woods, and easily accessible from there" (Flynn, *op cit.*, p. 228).

²⁰ Globe ed., pp 668-9. See Gottfried, "Irish Geography in Spenser's *View*," *ELH*, vi (1939), 133, 136-7.

²¹ To the west and south of Galtymore.

²² Ballingaddy, between Aherlow and Kilmallock, is in Irish *Baile in Gadaidhe*, "Town of Thieves."

²³ Murray's *Handbook for Ireland*, 6th ed., pp. [15], 401.

²⁴ For example, his river "Molanna." See note 15 above.

²⁵ His familiarity with Milesian stories, however, is discussed in my "Spenser's Tale of the Two Sons of Milesio," *MLQ*, III (1942), 547-557.

²⁶ Mentioned *passim* in the *View*. Doubtless Spenser coined the names of Brianor and Briana with Brian in mind (Henley, p. 127).

Specific references to the MacBrians of Ara and the O'Briens of Aherlow appear frequently in the State Papers; e. g., "Red Roche, . . . M'Brian O'Gonagh, M'Brian Arra, O'Brien of Arloe and others" (C. S. P. I. 1574-85, p. 90); see also Carew MSS, 1575-88, p. 41, etc. (The Ara river, north of the Aherlow, runs parallel to it and joins it in Muskery Quirk before reaching the Suir.)

whose terrifying war-cry of "Launlaider" meant "the strong hand" ²⁷ and who were satisfied to trace their ancestry to Brian Boru only six hundred years earlier.

ROLAND M SMITH

The University of Illinois

NOTES ON THE PLIMPTON MANUSCRIPT OF THE COURT OF SAPIENCE

When Robert Spindler was preparing his critical edition of the *Court of Sapience*,¹ he was not aware of the existence of a comparatively early manuscript of this poem then in the library of the Earl of Carlisle at Naworth Castle, Cumberland, and now in the Plimpton Collection at Columbia University. Miss Eleanor P. Hammond also did not make use of this manuscript for her text of the *Court of Sapience*² and I too was ignorant of its existence when working on the sources of the text.³ A full description of this MS.⁴ may be found in the *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1935-37, II, p. 1799), while the additional stanzas at the end of the poem, unique in this MS., have been printed by Karl Brunner.⁵ Through the courtesy of the Columbia University Library, the present writer has been able to obtain a complete set of photostats and hopes, when more favorable circumstances permit, to bring out a new edition of this poem, making full use of the Plimpton manuscript. In the meantime, a few notes on the new MS. may not be without interest.

²⁷ *View*, Globe ed., p. 632 (mentioned by Irenaeus in a "Milesian" passage). The Irish phrase *lámh láidir* (lit., "powerful hand") has come to mean "might without right."

¹ *Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, Heft 6, Leipzig, 1927.

² *English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey*, Durham, N. C., pp. 258-67.

³ *The Sources of the Court of Sapience* (*Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, Heft 23), Leipzig, 1932.

⁴ An unpublished Master's Essay by Grace M. Schubert (*The Court of Sapience. A Collation of the Plimpton Manuscript, with Introduction and Notes*, June 1937) is on deposit in the Columbia University Library.

⁵ "Bisher unbekannte Schlussstrophen des *Court of Sapience*," *Anglia*, LXII, 258-62.

Although the present MS wants the first folio, the second contains the last two stanzas of the "Proheme," a fortunate circumstance since neither of the other two early manuscripts (Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 3 21 and Hailey 2251) preserves this Proheme. Hitherto this part of the poem has been known only from the Caxton edition⁶ and this circumstance has led some scholars⁷ to attribute the Proheme to Caxton himself. The occurrence of the two stanzas in this manuscript, a MS clearly independent of the Caxton edition and probably earlier in point of date, substantiates Spindler's belief (p. 119) "dass Caxton als Autor des Proommums nicht in Frage kommt, vielmehr sprechen alle Kriterien dafür, dass der Verfasser des Hauptgedichtes auch der Dichter des Proommums ist." The two stanzas are printed below with variant readings from the Caxton text as printed by Spindler indicated by C:

(9)

- I you honoure ble we lawde and glouise
 And to whose presence my boke shall atteyne
 His hasty dome I pray hym modifie
 60 And not detraye ne haue it in disdayne
 ffor I purpose no makynge to distayne
 Meke eere good tunge & spirit pacient
 Who hath thise thre my boke I hym present

(10)

- And as hym lust let hym detray & adde
 65 ffor sith I am constreynd for to write
 Be my souerayn and haue a mater gladdo

57 blesse]blysse C lawde]loue C 59 hasty]hastif C 61 to]for to C;
 corrected to to by Spindler. 62 eere]herte C 64 lyst C &]or C 66

⁶ Spindler, *op. cit.*, p. 20, states erroneously that four copies of Caxton's edition are known, viz. British Museum, St. John's College, Oxford; Earl Spencer, Althorpe; and Maurice Johnson. The Maurice Johnson copy is, of course, identical with the British Museum one, having been purchased by the Museum in 1898. The Earl Spencer Caxtons were purchased by Mrs. Rylands for the John Rylands library as long ago as 1892. Compare Seymour de Ricci, *A Census of Caxtons*, Bibliographical Society, 1909.

⁷ So Joseph Ames (Ames-Herbert-Dibdin, *Typographical Antiquities*, London, 1810-19, I, 325-30) and William Blades, *The Life and Typography of William Caxton*, London, 1861-63, II, 114-16. See Joseph Schick, *Lydgate's Temple of Glas*, EETS, LX, p. cxi, and Spindler, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-19.

And can not please paynt [] ne endite
 Lete ignoraunce & childhode haue the witte
 I aske no moore but god of his mercy
 70 My boke conserue from sclaudir & envy

Be|By C glad C 67 [] *word omitted in MS*, enourne C 68
 witte|wyte C 70 conserue|conferme C

Three points are worth noting. In line 67, the scribe, apparently not sure of the reading in his original, has left a space, a procedure followed elsewhere in the text. In line 68, the reading "wyte" (punishment) of the Caxton version is clearly preferable to the "witte" of the Plimpton MS and is confirmed by the rhyme. For the Caxton reading in line 70, Spindler has the following note (p 217). "*conferme from* ist sonst nicht belegt, jedenfalls Kontamination zweier Konstruktionen *to keep from + to confirm sth. (sic)*" The present manuscript proves that the Caxton reading is no more than a compositor's error, probably brought about by the similarity between the long *s* and the *f* of the middle English hand.⁸

The nine additional stanzas forming the "Tractatus de Spe" together with an Epilogue were printed by Brunner, two of his readings deserve special discussion. For lines 2315-17, Brunner prints:

And how that she as grounde of all chaunce
 Diffundis the certeyne abidyng
 Of blis to man *and* lyfe all way lastyng

Now the editor notes that the first word in line 2316 is found in the MS. as "Diffund is", as I read the word,⁹ the MS. has "Diffinid is". Both readings, it seems to me, are possible. According to Brunner, the meaning is that Hope as ground (i. e. bottom of the well) of all chance pours out the certain abiding, etc.; the other reading would yield a different meaning, namely that Hope is defined (set forth) as ground (Foundation) of all chance, as the certain abiding, etc. Whatever the author may have intended, it seems quite clear from the Plimpton MS. that the scribe accepted the latter reading.

For lines 2356-59, Brunner offers the following reading.

⁸ The same point is made by Miss Schubert in her Essay

⁹ Miss Schubert, *op. cit.*, gives the same reading

O souerayne prince O god invariaunt
 what wight may haue grace moie exuberant
 than with good hope in the thei cost to fede
 who throwith in the heven shalbe his mede

The meaning of the third line (Miss Grace Schubert incidentally adopts the same reading) is not, however, clear to the present writer. As I read the manuscript, the eighth word in this line is not "cost" but "oost." In this case, the meaning would be "what man may have more exuberant grace than, with good hope in The, to eat 'ther' (read the) Host (the Sacrament)" We may note in passing that the earliest use of "exuberant" recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary* is 1503.

Whether these additional stanzas are by the author of the *Court of Sapience* or not is a problem discussed both by Brunner and Schubert. Brunner states emphatically "dass diese Strophen dem Dichter des *Court of Sapience* angehoren ist wohl nicht zu bezweifeln," while Miss Schubert is more hesitant. She declares: "It is quite possible, of course, that the *De spe* was written by the scribe who copied the Plimpton MS." My own observations tend to confirm Brunner's belief, in any event, it seems certain to me that the scribe was not the author of these lines. Twice words are interlineated and one line (2364) contains one word too many. The line in question reads:

Through hope he gete life love grace & lastyng blis

It would be metrically desirable to delete either "life" or "love." Finally in line 2350 "also" is given as the rhyme-word for "portreture: cure." It seems most unlikely that the scribe, if he were also the author of these lines, would have permitted these errors to creep into the text.

Since it seems reasonable to suppose that these lines were also written by the poet of the *Court of Sapience*,¹⁰ some explanation must be offered for the prose portion printed by Spindler as the conclusion of the poem in his edition. As the manuscript used by Spindler (Trinity R. 3. 21.) ends at line 2079, the editor depended for the remainder of the text on Caxton's edition. To any student of Caxton, the explanation for the presence of the prose section at the end of the poem is relatively simple. Whenever in the course

¹⁰ Brunner, *op. cit.*, points out that from the point of view of context, these lines form an integral part of the poem.

of printing a volume Caxton found that he had some blank pages at his disposal, he utilized this space by printing whatever material came to hand. Whether these texts were relevant or irrelevant to the main text seems to have been a matter of little concern to the earliest English printer. For example, at the end of Lydgate's *Horse, Sheep and Goose*¹¹ he added some stanzas which had no connection with the poem whatsoever and in addition included a further treatise described by Blades as "The proper use of various nouns substantive and verbs." Other such instances include the Caxton edition of the *Temple of Brass* (i. e. *Parliament of Fowls*), the *De consolacione philosophiae*, and the *Governayle of Helthe*.¹² The last quire of the Caxton edition of the *Court of Sapience* is a quaternion and the poem itself ends on the verso of the fourth leaf. Caxton, having thus several blank leaves on his hands, chose to fill two of these with the matter printed by Spindler, though this prose passage has nothing whatever to do with the poem itself.

These few points indicate that a new edition of the *Court of Sapience* is most desirable. Such an edition should include the "Tractatus de Spe" and omit the prose section printed by Spindler, which, as we have seen, is entirely due to Caxton. In addition, the Plimpton MS. offers a considerable number of new and valuable readings for the main text, since it is a manuscript of prime importance. With this new text, the present writer plans to include a revision of his own work on the sources of the poem.

CURT F. BÜHLER

The Pierpont Morgan Library

THE RISE OF THE CATALAN LANGUAGE IN THE 13TH CENTURY

One of the most significant factors in the process of secularization, which, beginning in the 13th century, eventually was to change the entire aspect of medieval life, was the ever-increasing use of the vernacular in prose. To meet the rising demands of laymen

¹¹ See my paper "Lydgate's *Horse, Sheep and Goose* and Huntington MS HM 144," *MLN.*, LV, 563-69.

¹² Compare Blades, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 61, 67 and 214.

for literary entertainment and scientific instruction of all kinds in their own language, the vernacular had to attack the sovereignty of Latin in one field after another. As early as the first decades of the 13th century authors in France, Italy, Germany and in the Spanish kingdom of Castile successfully approached the task of developing vernacular prose in various fields and for various purposes according to the individual requirements of their countries and surroundings. In Castile, especially, popular prose was steadily on the increase in scientific and literary works by the middle of the century. Except for a few attempts in religious prose which can be dated at the end of the 12th or the beginning of the 13th century, however, it was not until the last decades of the 13th century,¹ that the Catalan language followed the general trend of the age, and the number of original works composed at that time is extremely small. The great bulk of datable texts written in Catalan belongs to the 14th and 15th centuries.² It is in the period of Catalan conquests overseas that the beginning of a literature written in the Catalan vernacular falls, hence it seems clear that the rise of the Catalan language and literature is related to the political development which raised the little country in an astonishingly short space of time to the very climax of its political existence.³

The great increase in territory and political influence which the *Condes-reyes* of Catalonia-Aragon gained in Southern France through marriage and inheritance in the course of the 12th century proved very unfavorable to the political and cultural development of Catalonia. For inheritance of the county of Provence and suzerainty acquired over a number of powerful feudal lords in South-

¹ See J. Miret y Sans, "El més antic text literari escrit en català," *Revista de bibliografia catalana*, iv, no. 1 (1914); *Homilies d'Organya* (Barcelona, 1915).

² Morel-Fatio, "Katalanische Literatur," *Gr. Gr.*, II, ii, 82.

³ The region where Catalan was spoken at the beginning of the 13th century, before the great conquests, is, on the Spanish side of the Pyrenees, defined by the political borders of the Principality of Catalonia, a region to which in the ecclesiastical organization the diocese of Tarragona (the Roman province *Hispania Tarraconensis*) corresponded; on the other side of the Pyrenees it included the county of Roussillon. See W. Meyer-Lübke, *Das Katalanische* (Heidelberg, 1925), pp. 1 and 183. On the historical and ethnic conditions for the linguistic separation of Catalan from Provençal and Spanish respectively see Meyer-Lübke, *ibid.*, pp. 158 ff. and 173 ff.

ern France meant that the interests of the rulers of Catalonia-Aragon were gravitating towards their French dominions and that cultural activities were strongly influenced by southern cultural life centred in nearby Toulouse. Furthered by the close linguistic relations between Catalan and the language of the troubadours, provençal poetry found a swift and unrestricted acceptance in Catalonia and was cultivated throughout the 12th and 13th centuries by the Catalan feudal lords and noblemen, among them members of the Catalanian dynasty like Alfons (I of Catalonia, II of Aragon), Peter II, Peter III and James II.⁴

As a consequence Catalan popular poetry, which had made a promising beginning with religious poetry and probably also with epic was regularly made to conform to the poetic style and metrical system of Provençal poetry.⁵ Even Ramon Lull, the first true Catalan poet after the Provençal intrusion, did not entirely free himself from the convention. Still less did the other poets who formed the school of transition between the poets of Provençal allegiance in Catalonia and the first true Catalan school of poetry, the consistory of *Gay saber*, founded at the end of the 16th century.⁶

But, while the cultural dependence of Catalonia upon Provence lasted throughout the century, its political dependence had reached a sudden end almost a century earlier when Peter the Catholic's interference in the Albigensian wars ended in his defeat and death on the battlefield of Muret (1213). This event, although of catastrophic consequences for the position of the Count-kings in Southern France, must be considered to have given birth to a new Catalonia-Aragon, new in the sense that it was to rely mainly on the constructive powers of the Catalan people.⁷ For one of the

⁴ See M. Milá y Fontanals, *De los trovadores en España* (Barcelona, 1861), chaps II and III.

⁵ See M. G. Silvestre, *Història sumària de la literatura catalana* (Barcelona, 1932), pp. 5-10. For the problem whether there had existed a popular epic in Catalan the theory of an original verse text underlying the *Crònica* of James I is important. The investigations made by M. de Montoliu show that epic poetry also followed the general trend of the time in undergoing Provençal and French literary influence. See Montoliu, "Sobre el primitiu text versificat de la crònica de Jaume I," *Anuari de l'Oficina Romànica*, I (1928), 83 f.

⁶ See Morel-Fatio, "Katalanische Literatur," *Gr Gr*, II, 11, 76 f.

⁷ For the political events see in general F. Soldevila, *Història de Cata-*

decisive factors which turned James I, Peter's young son, from the policy of favouring the heretics of Southern France and inclined him to revive the *reconquista* with a military expedition against the Saracen strongholds in the Balearics must undoubtedly have been the insistence of the Catalan merchants that the Mediterranean trade routes be freed from the constant threat of the Moorish corsairs. Catalan cities and a great part of the Catalan nobility supported the king with arms, ships and money, while the troublesome Aragonese aristocracy, being chiefly concerned with the maintenance of their old rights of independence, refused help in the most critical moments of the struggle. It is natural, therefore, that the glorious conquest of the Balearic islands, Valencia and Murcia (1229, 1233, 1239, 1266) was intended by the king to further primarily the interests of the Catalans. They were given preference in the colonization of the new territories, especially in the kingdoms of Valencia and the Balearics, which were united with Catalonia-Aragon, but also in Murcia, which James according to a previous agreement had conquered for the Castilian king.⁸ These great conquests were the first political events in the history of Catalonia to prove of paramount importance for the expansion of the Catalan language.⁹ For along with their methods of trade, cultivation of the land, local government, etc. the Catalans carried their language into the conquered regions which, thereafter, despite some differentiations in dialects, formed with the mother country a linguistic unit.¹⁰ In the new Spanish kingdom of Valencia the reception of Catalan was probably furthered by the fact that the newly introduced idiom could find a responsive background among the Christian population which had retained some Romance from the pre-Arabic period.¹¹

lunga (Barcelona, 1934), I, chaps. x ff.; R. B. Merriman, *The rise of the Spanish empire* (New York, 1918), chap. vi.

⁸ Ramon Muntaner, *Oronica*, chap. xvii stresses the fact that all the inhabitants of the cities in Murcia which he mentions were good Catalans and spoke *el bell catalanesch*.

⁹ Meyer-Lübke, *Das Katalanische*, pp. 1 ff.

¹⁰ This must be stressed in spite of the fact that the local patriots of Valencia and the Balearics both claimed that they possessed a peculiar language. See Morel-Fatio, *Gr. Gr.*, I², 843; A. Rubió y Lluch, *Del nombre y de la unidad de la lengua catalana* (Barcelona, 1930).

¹¹ Meyer-Lübke, *Das Katalanische*, pp. 160, 183.

The spectacular successes of the king of Aragon-Catalonia and his peoples not only resulted in the spread of the Catalan language in the enlarged area under Catalan rule but also extended the radius of its influence to all those maritime places along the coast of Spain, Africa and the Italian peninsula, where representatives of the Catalan merchant class, the *cònsols de mar*, settled under the protection of privileges granted by the king and where the Catalan maritime customs (known under the name of the *Llibre del Consolat de mar*) were in force.¹² But, in contrast to this swift rise of the Catalan language as the idiom of Mediterranean interrelations, the process of introducing it for the conduct of public affairs was a rather slow one. Although James I adapted his policies to the wishes of his Catalan noblemen and cities, he nevertheless had to consider the equal claims of his Aragonese population, and he would probably have met with strong resistance from one quarter or the other, had he tried, as his contemporary on the Castilian throne had done, to introduce a vernacular in his chancery.¹³ It was politic, therefore, to keep Latin as the official language, and, in fact, this language retained its position throughout the century in spite of attacks from both sides. Time and again, however, Catalan or Aragonese, sometimes also Castilian, according to the region concerned, replaced it in the internal administration,¹⁴ and very soon after the conquest of the

¹² The result of the discussion concerning the origin of the *Llibre dels costums marítims* or *del Consolat de Mar* is that the original text was in Catalan, written in the second half of the 13th century, probably about the same time that the Catalan redaction of the famous Catalan code, the *Usatges de Barcelona* was made. See Silvestre, *Història sumària*, pp 68 ff. On the spread of the language in general see A. Rubió y Lluch, *Documents per l'història de la cultura catalana mig-eva* (Barcelona, 1908-1921), II, Introd pp xvii ff.

¹³ On the use of vernacular in the chanceries of the Spanish kingdom see *Gr. Gr.*, II, II, 407. On old Catalan documents see A. Griera, "Carácter de los documentos catalanes antiguos," *Spanische Forschungen*, I (1928), 142 ff.

¹⁴ There are various instances which show that general orders directed to officials of both Aragonese and Catalan speaking regions were written in both languages, or in Castilian and Catalan. See Is. Carini, *Gli archivi e le biblioteche di Spagna*. (Palermo, 1884), II, 27 and 28 f, in which are published extracts of documents found in the registers of the kings in the *Archivo de la Corona de Aragón*.

Moorish kingdoms an Arabic department must have been incorporated in the chancery, with an Arabic clerk (*alfaqui*) capable of drafting an Arabic letter.¹⁵ A great advantage was won by the Catalan language in its constant race with Aragonese for victory over Latin at the time when the kingdom of Valencia and also the Balearics were considered belonging to the Catalan-speaking regions. not only were most of the privileges granted to the Catalan colonists written in Catalan,¹⁶ but on many occasions the king addressed the Arabic communities of the kingdom of Valencia in Catalan, the language which he wished to spread and popularize as a means to unity among the multilingual and multiracial population of these regions.¹⁷

In contrast to the first period of Catalan conquests, the second victorious period marked by the expansion of Catalan rule overseas from Sicily to Greece and over the islands of Malta, Gozo and Sardinia (1282-1322), was not attended by a considerable increase in territory where the Catalan language would prevail. Although Catalan filtered into the Sicilian dialect and into Greek and although it was later accepted as the official language in the chanceries of the new countries which had come under the control of the Aragonese dynasty and was spoken by the ruling classes there, it did not, except to a certain extent in Sardinia, supersede the native idioms as it had done in the Arabic kingdoms of Valencia, Mallorca and parts of Murcia.¹⁸ This period of great

¹⁵ A later instance is a *littera* (sic!) *morisca* dated Valencia, 1284, Apr. 10. See Carini, *loc. cit.*, II, 30.

¹⁶ The kings granted special privileges when they provided their followers with land. See the *carta de població* by James I for citizens of Barcelona, granted in 1270, in A. de Capmany, *Memorias históricas sobre la marina, el comercio, etc. de la antigua ciudad de Barcelona* (Madrid, 1779-1792), II, 36 f., no. xvi. The salutation formula of this document is in Latin while the text is in Catalan.

¹⁷ A good instance is provided by a document dated 1283, Aug. 2, beginning "Pere etc. als feus seus alemins (chiefs of the Arabic communities) et veyls et a tots altres sarraïns de les alïames (Arabic or Hebrew communities) del regne de Valencia. . . ." See *Documentos inéditos del Archivo de la Corona de Aragón* (Barcelona, 1849 . . .), VI, no. LVII.

¹⁸ On the spread of Catalan in Greece and the Orient see the various studies by Rubió y Lluch, especially "La llengua catalana a Grecia," *Primer Congrés internacional de la llengua catalana* (Barcelona, 1906),

political events, however, furthered the Catalan language in a way which was not without influence in its rise to the dignity of a literary language. Catalan was introduced as the language of politics and diplomacy in the chanceries of the states bordering the Mediterranean basin. The Sicilian enterprise of Peter III, which had been initiated by his father James who had contrived his son's marriage with Constance, daughter of Manfred of Sicily, was preceded by an intensive political preparation through negotiations for peace alliances and agreements with foreign powers on a scale hitherto unknown in medieval history.¹⁹ While the negotiations with Castile, Portugal, England, France and the Roman Church proceeded as usual in Latin, those with the Arabic rulers along the African coast and in part also those with the Italian maritime cities seem to have been conducted mostly in Catalan.²⁰ The reason for the choice of the Catalan language in these instances was that the negotiations were with maritime powers and involved specific interests of the Catalans. The king was to rely mainly on the advanced nautical skill and daring spirit of his Catalans when he built up a strong fleet and started the dangerous expedition to Africa and Sicily. He was therefore eager to grant whatever they asked as recompense for their help. Even when his interest was merely political the king tried to interpret his actions as promot-

pp 236-247. In certain parts of Sardinia Catalan replaced the native idiom, but to-day it remains only in Alghero. See H. Kuen, "El dialecto de Algier y su posición en la historia de la lengua catalana," *Anuari de l'Oficina Romànica* (Barcelona, 1932-34), 124. See in general A. Farinelli, "Italia e Spagna," in *Divagazioni erudite* (Turin, 1825), p. 238.

¹⁹ See H. Wieruszowski, "Conjuraciones y alianzas políticas del rey Pedro de Aragón contra Carlos de Anjou antes de las Vísperas Sicilianas," *Boletín de la Academia de historia de Madrid* (1935), pp. 547-620 (quoted as "Conjuraciones").

²⁰ See M. L. de Mas Latrie, *Tratés de paix et de commerce . . . concernant les relations des chrétiens avec les arabes de l'Afrique septentrionale*. (Paris, 1865), nos II, III and IV (pp. 280 ff.). II and III are alliances concluded by James I in 1271 and 1274 with the king of Tunis and the Sultan of Morocco respectively. IV is the great commercial treaty between King Peter and Miralmumin Bohap (Abu Hafs), king of Tunis (1285). Also in Catalan are the treaties concluded by James II with the Signoria of Genoa, with the Sultan of Egypt, the Emir of Morocco, the king of Tunis (1292, 1306-1314), etc. See Capmany, *Memorias históricas* etc., IV, nos. VII, VIII, XI and XII, Mas Latrie *Tratés de paix etc.*, nos VII-XII (pp. 292 ff.).

ing the special advantage of the Catalan merchants and shipowners, for example in the case of his military intervention in Tunis about two years before he began his Sicilian expedition.²¹ The use of Catalan in most of the documents dealing with political and commercial problems overseas was certainly considered a means of demonstrating that the king was first of all speaking in the name of his Catalan people. In addition, the choice of language may have been a matter of convenience. For important missions to countries which already offered markets and customers or which might offer them, the king often chose laymen as his negotiators—representatives of the wealthy city of Barcelona,—²² for whom Catalan was certainly the natural idiom to use in their negotiations, for direct discussion of terms with the Moors or for the final drafting of agreements (which were mostly in Catalan and Arabic) they could avail themselves of the translators and interpreters who were at hand in the *consolats de mar* in such places as Bugia, Tlemcen and Tunis.²³ But, apart from practical considerations which may have led to the use of Catalan in political negotiations at that time, could the patriotism of the Catalans, which on the eve of the Sicilian expedition rose quickly and fiercely under the impact of the growing enmity of France and the Guelph powers in Italy have found a better means of expressing itself than the use of its own language? Indeed, when the king of France, alarmed by Peter's preparations, asked for an explanation in a challenging letter written in French, Peter answered in the same tone—and in Catalan.²⁴

²¹ I published Peter's missive to the *universitas* of Barcelona dealing with his military enterprise in Tunis, dated 1270, Oct. 21, in "Conjuraciones," pp. 599 f., no. 16.

²² Such was Bernardo Porteri who between 1276 and 1279 was sent on various missions to the kings of Morocco and Tlemcen and to the Sultan of the Mamelukes. See "Conjuraciones," p. 581.

²³ When Peter in 1280 sent to Tunis the governor of Valencia, Eximio de Luna, he provided him with Catalan and Arabic credentials. I published the Catalan version, including the notice that an Arabic copy had been made, in *Estudis Universitaris Catalans* (1934), p. 177. See also "Conjuraciones," p. 580, note 6. It is significant that in the negotiations with the kingdom of Granada where no special interests of the Catalans were involved, Latin was used; *ibid.*, p. 583.

²⁴ The two warlike letters are published by A. de Saint Priest, *Histoire de la conquête de Naples*, iv (Paris, 1849), p. 303.

From the point of view of later political and cultural developments, including that of the language, not only the public but also the private activities of the great kings of the 13th century seem consistently to have strengthened Catalan cultural life. What strikes the student of the kings' registers in the Archives of Barcelona, which are especially complete and informative for the second half of the century, is that among the Latin documents concerning the administration of the country and foreign politics are many pieces dealing with the household and court of King James and of the Infant Peter who later became king and that almost all these pieces are in Catalan. These account books, diaries, lists of presents and objects (mostly jewels and mass requisites) pledged for loans,²⁵ and above all the *Ordenament* for the officers of Peter's household in 1276-77,²⁶ are suggestive of the Catalan tone which the princes of this dynasty had imposed upon their court, where the majordomo, the treasurer and numerous other officers were Catalans (not Aragonese) and where the idiom used for all kinds of administrative affairs was Catalan too. This preference for the Catalan language and the Catalan way of life was certainly due to King James' earliest political experiences when in his troubles with rebels against his rule—mostly Aragonese nobles—he had found loyal assistance among the Catalan noblemen and the Catalan cities. Furthermore, since he began his career as a soldier when he was nine years old and spent almost three-quarters of his life on horseback in campaigning, he had but little education, probably

²⁵ They are all transmitted to us in the registers of the kings. Among the inventories the earliest is the one drawn up by *Simon de la Capela del seyor rey* about 1258-59 (Reg 10, fol 104^r) in which, along with precious mass requisites, books are listed, for example *l quatern de les esto-ries*, probably a volume containing lives of the Saints—Some of the registers, like the Regs 31-35 of the Infant Peter, are entirely filled by accounts. One document of this type, an account rendered by a Catalan shipping company (*ca* 1265), found in Reg 17, fol. 117 ff., is of tremendous political importance because it lists all the ambassadors from the far eastern countries sent to the court of James I and for this reason traveling in one of the company's ships. See Fr. Carreras y Candi, "La creuada de Jaume I a terra santa 1269-70," in *Miscelanea historica catalana* (Barcelona, 1905-1906), II, 273-305.

²⁶ The *Ordenaments del Senyor rey en Pere* (1276-77), transmitted only in a fragmentary condition, are published in *Colección de documentos inéditos*, IV, no. II.

knew no Latin, and did not indulge in poetical activities in Provençal fashion as had been the custom in his family²⁷ In his conversation as well as in his correspondence he used the idiom in which he had been brought up in the house of the Templars of Montson in Catalonia.²⁸ Because of his great influence, his example together with the protection which he probably gave to Catalan authors like Ramon Lull and others contributed immensely to the rise of Catalan to the dignity of a literary language.²⁹ In fact, at the end of his long reign (1213-1276) the Catalan idiom appeared for the first time in original literary works. It was then, about 1272, that Ramon Lull, who had frequented James' court in his secular life, started his encyclopedic production in which the Catalan language first replaced the conventional Provençal in poetry and was shown to be suitable for all literary undertakings, including even the development of a philosophical vocabulary;³⁰ and it was at this time that the king or a person near to his throne composed the *Llibre dels feyts del rey En Jaume*,³¹ the first of a series of great Catalan military chronicles.

The Catalan character of James' court also had political consequences which in turn influenced the development of the language in what we may call its political and diplomatic career. Catalan appeared to be established firmly enough at James' court to resist the influx of new and strong cultural elements which entered the household of the Infant Peter with the arrival in Catalonia of Constance of Sicily, the princess whom James had chosen for his son. The account books of the Majordomo of the young couple list a great many persons of Italian origin in the permanent entourage of the young princess, recognizable by the *Ser* and *Madonna* added to their names, and they paint a detailed and vivid picture

²⁷ See Silvestre, *Història sumària*, pp. 32 f.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 32. See also J. Massó Torrents, "Historiografía de Catalunya," *Revista Hispanique*, xv (1906), 506 f.; Milà y Fontanals, *De los trovadores en España*, p. 490.

²⁹ See Silvestre, *op. cit.*, pp. 47 ff. and 64. On the cultural and literary activities of the Aragonese dynasty from James on see Rubió y Lluch, *Documents*, I, pp. XXXIV ff. and II, pp. XXII ff.; H. Finke, "Die Beziehungen der aragonesischen Könige zur Literatur, etc." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, VIII (1910), 20 ff.

³⁰ Silvestre, *op. cit.*, pp. 35 ff., 52 ff.; N. Olwer, *Literatura catalana* (Barcelona, 1918), pp. 79 ff.

³¹ Silvestre, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

of the comings and goings of innumerable *Lombardi* (= Italian) and Sicilian merchants, physicians, minstrels, falconers, messengers, and later—after Manfred's disaster—political refugees. They also preserve the daily entries of expenditures for all kinds of luxuries in food and clothing to which Constance had been accustomed at the magnificent court of her father but which had been unknown to the Spartan kings of the Aragonese dynasty.³² Yet in these accounts there is no trace whatsoever of the use of the Italian language for any purpose. Quite the contrary. The young princess and her Italian pages were carefully taught to speak, read and write the Catalan idiom.³³ The political consequences of this care given to the Catalan education of the young Italians at Peter's court are clearly to be seen in the rôle which Constance and some of her pages, like Loria and the Lancias, played later in the Sicilian events. After the conquest it is true Peter tried to reconcile the Sicilians to the rule of another foreigner by making use of the great respect and authority which members of the royal family who were descended from Manfred and nobles of Loria's rank enjoyed among the population. Yet he could be sure that because of their careful Catalan education they would not impede his efforts to establish a completely Catalan government—a goal which he pursued with such severity as finally to arouse against himself the same Sicilian patriots who had formerly risen up against the French regime of Charles of Anjou.³⁴ In fact, when in 1283, just before his return to Catalonia, he left the government of Sicily in the hands of Constance and his son James and under the protection of Roger Loria, whom he nominated admiral of Catalonia and Sicily, the government continued to function as part of the Catalan government at home. The Sicilian registers show that affairs were run in exactly the same way as in the mother country. This was true also in the matter of languages. In administrative affairs Latin still predominated,

³² See my article, "La corte di Pietro d'Aragona e i precedenti dell'impresa siciliana, I," *Archivio storico italiano*, xvi (1938), 146.

³³ On Lancia and Loria see notes 35 and 37. The account books after the arrival of Constance (1262) list the expenditures for a *scola* and an *escolanus* for the young people at Peter's court. See "La corte di Pietro d'Aragona," p. 149.

³⁴ See M. Amari, *La guerra del Vespro Siciliano* (9th ed., Milano, 1886), I, chap. IX.

with Catalan slowly filtering in, while in private correspondence members of the royal family, Loria and the Lancias used mainly Catalan.³⁵ About the time (1296) when the Sicilian chancery was taken over by Conrad Lancia,³⁶ one of the Italians at Peter's court who were praised by Muntaner for their *bell catalanesch*,³⁷ Catalan began to occupy the place as official language in the Sicilian part of the Catalan "empire" which it was to hold for many centuries to come.³⁸ The tremendous political influence which Catalonia-Aragon then gained in the reign of James II quickly raised the idiom to the height of its importance, ranging it alongside Latin and Aragonese at such courts as the Roman Curia, Naples, France and even Vienna.³⁹

Meanwhile, in the country of its origin which in so short a time, as if by a miracle, had seen its rule, its customs, its commercial law and its language spread over the whole Mediterranean basin as far as Asia Minor and Greece⁴⁰ the language had become a symbol not only of national individuality but also of national pride and self-consciousness.⁴¹

HELENE WIERUSZOWSKI

The Johns Hopkins University

³⁵ I have published a Catalan letter written by Peter to Constance in 1280 in "Conjuraciones," pp. 590 ff., no. 4. A Catalan letter which Infant Alfonso, Peter's oldest son, directed to his parents from Sicily in 1285 is published by Finke, *Spanische Forschungen*, IV (1933), 433, no. 22. Instances of Catalan letters written by Loria are found in Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, see III, 102 ff.

³⁶ See "La corte di Pietro d'Aragona," p. 148, note 34.

³⁷ *Cronica*, chap. XVIII.

³⁸ See Farinelli, "Italia e Spagna," p. 238.

³⁹ See Rubió y Lluch, *Documents*, II, pp. LXIX ff., Finke, *Acta*, I, pp. CLI ff.

⁴⁰ The whole chronicle of Ramon Muntaner, written about 1330, is dedicated to the glorification of this "miracle."

⁴¹ It was at about the end of the century that the name of the people was applied to the idiom—*catalanesch catalanischus*, replacing the older, more general terms *romang*, *lingua romana*, *nostre lati*, *lemosí*, etc. In the later 14th century terms like *català*, *la llengua catalana*, Lat. *catalanus* were also used. See Morel-Fatio, *Gr. Gr.*, I³, 843; Rubió y Lluch, *Documents*, II, pp. lxi ff.

FACTEN, FISCHFACKTEN, FLOßFACTEN, AND
SIMILAR WORDS

Conrad Gesner's *Historia animalium qui est de piscibus*, published in 1558, was translated into German in 1563 by Conrad Forer.¹ This celebrated work, cited sometimes under Forer, sometimes under Gesner, has frequently been used by German lexicographers, but not exhaustively: a careful study still yields an abundance of interesting material.

In detailed descriptions of dozens of species of fish, the word for *fin* (Latin *pinna*, modern German *Flosse*) would naturally occur very abundantly. Most frequently Forer translates *pinna* by *Facten*, *Feckten*.

oben auff dem ruggen namlich die gantze facten (fol 4^b), Oben auff dem kopff hat er ein fekten gleich einem kamm (5^a), schwartze flacken bey den galben facten der oren, ein andere in der facten bey dem arß (15^a), mit roten flacken besprenget, als dann auch der facten von dem arß auff den schwantz (15^b), Die zwen facten bey den fischoren (17^b), Bey den oren hat er zwen rot facten (19^a), Der facten auff dem ruggen hat lange, rote spitz (20^b), Die zwo facten am bauch (24^a), Auff dem ruggen hat er zwen facten Die erste klein . die ander . groß (43^b), diser facten, so er nidergelegt, wirdt verborgen die so vnden gegen dem schwantz ist goldfarb (45^b), zwey kleine facten bey den oren (48^b), Die facten auff dem ruggen ist rotlicht (56^a), hat zwen facten gleich einer Flädermauß (67^b), die zwen facten bey dem schwantz (85^a), mit dreyen facten (86^a) die breite von der vnderen facten biß zu ende der oberen (10^b).

I have noted no less than 75 instances of *Facten*, the noun usually appears as masculine, compare however *in der facten* (15^a), *Die zwo facten* (24^a), *die so vnden* (43^b), *zwey kleine facten* (48^b); *Die facten . . . ist* (56^a), *von der vnderen facten*

¹Weigand used the edition of 1563, as did Kluge, Grimm used an edition of 1598 I have before me the edition of 1575 *Fischbüch, Das ist ein kurtze/doch vollkome beschreybung aller Fischen* Erstlich in Latin durch den hochgeleerten herren D Cünradt Gæßner beschrieben yetz newlich aber durch D Cünradt Forer . in das Teutsch gebracht . . . Getruckt zu Zurich bey Christoffel Froschower . M D LXXV Six preliminary and CCII numbered leaves, in folio. Kluge's reference (under *Kabeljau*) to the 1563 edition also fits that of 1575, Grimm's reference (under *Wag*, col. 336), to the 1598 edition, also fits that of 1575 It would seem, therefore, that these three editions agree page for page

(86^a) The *DWb* has no entry for *Fackten*, but under *Facken*, *m ala*, three instances of *Fackten* are cited from *Forei*, the spelling being identical with that of the edition of 1575. Grimm, giving only the definition *ala*, seems to consider these instances as signifying *wings* (i. e. of flying fish) rather than fins

In addition to *Fackten*, *Forei* uses also the diminutives *Facktle* (8 instances) and *Facktlin* (2 instances), which are not recorded in the *DWb*.

die zwey facktle bey den fisch oren sind galb, die anderen fackten braun (8^a), Die fecktle bey den oren braun (10^b), item auch die zwey facktle bey den oren (13^a), vnder dem vnderen kyffbaggen zwey rote facktle (56^a), hat er kleine goldtfarbe facktle, kurtz aber breyt (62^a), die facktle bey den oren vnd bauch rotlicht (180^a)

zwen lange zan, welche von zweyen facktlinen bedeckt vnd beschlossen werdend (117^a), Hat grune, fugestreckte augen, bedeckt sy mit etlichen facktlinen (129^a).

The two last instances occur in the description of crabs, not fish. Next in frequency after *Fackten* comes the compound *Fischfackten*, with over thirty instances. The word is not recorded in the *DWb*.

vnd die kleinen fäcktle gleych vnder den oren Seine fisch fackten alle sampt dem schwantz, mit schönen runden flacken bezieret (18^a), weniger flacken hat . keine am fischfackten deß ruggens (43^a); namlich daß jm sein floßfader oder fischfäckten so breit vnnnd groß, gleych oben von dem schnabel anhebt vnd sich biß an den schwantz streckt (44^a); sampt zweyen kleinen fischfackten zu end deß schwantzes (69^a); ergryft man jn by den zweyen fisch fächten bey dem schwantz (72^a), welches auß seinem iachen vnd grossen fischfäckten mag erschen werden (81^a); vnden an dem schwantz zweyfachte fäckten, als fisch fäckten die eyer zu beschirmen (126^b); hat scharpffe spitzige fischfackten auff dem ruggen, vnd vnden am bauch (161^a); auch in der oberen fisch oder floßfäckten auff dem ruggen, welches spitz weyßlecht seyn sollend (18)

The diminutives *Fischfecktle* and *Fischfecktlin* also occur.

Hat weyter bey beiden oren ein kleins fischfecktle, vnd eins auff dem ruggen (49^b); der schwantz drey ellen lang, welcher bey anfang ein kleins fischfecktlin sol gehabt haben (67^a).

Neither *Fischfecktle* nor *Fischfecktlin* is recorded in the *DWb*. The next word, *Floßfäckten*, of which seven instances have been noted, is likewise unrecorded; most frequently it designates the dorsal fin.

Sein floßfackten auff dem rugken ist gantz rot (25^b), mit grossen augen, goldfarb, wyssen floßfackten (26^b), von den schwartzen grossen floßfackten so sy habend (29^a), namlich zwuschend dem kopff vnd anfang der oberen floßfackten deß ruggens (41^b), Die floßfackten auff dem ruggen vnd der schwantz blauwlacht, die andern fackten rotlacht (170^a), vil schwartzer fläcken, auch an der floßfackten auff dem ruggen (189^b)

We now turn from compounds of *Fackten* to consider those of *Feder*. Most frequent is *Floßfeder*, with ten examples (The *DWb* (III, 1822) cites single instances from Steinhöwel (1487), Luther, and Jean Paul)

sein ruggen ist schwarzlacht, sein floßfäder grun (10^a), der schwantz vnnnd hinder floßfader deß ruggens rotlacht (12^a), die obern floßfäderen dunkelrot, item auch die zwey facktle bey den oren (13^a), die floßfäder auff dem rugken heyter rot (15^b), Er schwumpt mit vier floßfaderen der selben hat er zwo, die grosseren bey den oren, vnd zwo kleiner am bauch (57^a), hat die zwo floßfaderen vff dem ruggen zů nächst an einanderen gestellt (15^b), Sein floßfaderen sind so vil vnnnd also gesetzt, wie die figur beweyset (57^b), die hinderen faderen mit dem schwantz sind rotlecht. die ober floßfäder schwartzelecht (167^b)

Also here we have the diminutives *Floßfederlin* and *Floßfaderle*, which are not recorded in the *DWb*

biß an den schwantz, von gestalt vnd floßfaderlin einem Mackarell gleych (49^a), Dise all habend floßfaderle hinten am leyb (56^b)

Another compound with *Feder* is *Fischfeder*, of which five instances have been noted. Under *Fischfeder* the *DWb* (III, 1685) quotes no examples, but under *Flosse* (col. 1818) one instance of *vloß oder vischfeder* is cited from a glossary of the year 1482:

Seine fischfaderen so von vilen sprossen zůsamen gesetzt, söllend gantz schön seyn (86^b), hat zwo fischfaderen, yede 15 schüch lang (92^a), hat kein fischfaderen auff dem ruggen als der Vterwall (100^b), er hat kleine fischfaderen gagen (*compared with*) seinem corpel zů rachen (102^a); so braucht er seine fisch faderen, vorauß die hinderen an statt der füßen (102^b)

All these last instances occur in the description of various kinds of whales.

Strange to say, a contemporary German work by Heinrich Pantaleon (1522-1595) reveals quite a different terminology from that of Forer, and that despite the fact that Pantaleon, like Forer and Gesner, was a Swiss. The Latin edition of Geronymo Cardano's (1501-1576) *De rerum varietate* had been published at Basel in

1557, and Pantaleon must have begun the German translation almost immediately, as this appeared with the date 1559, also at Basel.² This work of Pantaleon is not mentioned by his biographer Johannes Bolte, in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (xxv, 128-131), and it has also been neglected by German lexicographers, despite the fact that it offers rich material for the study of the German language of the sixteenth century.

Pantaleon's normal rendering of *pinna* is *Gefider*, which occurs at least 56 times, together with one instance of *Fischgefider*

Doselbsten seind gemeinlich fisch on gefider, doch am geschmack gar suß das gefider ist ihnen geben, das sie mögend getragen werden darzü haben die aal kein gefider von wegen der runde (p 56), nennet man dases eigentlich fisch, so fischschoten vnd gefider hand (256), seind den fischen auch das gefider zügeeignet, vnd von nöten gewesen, dann ei mocht sich nit bewegen, noch hin vnd har fairen, so die gefider nit vorhanden [*On margin Fischgefider*] Deßhalben hatt die natur zweyerley arthen gefider machen sollen, wiewol in dem nammen kein vnderscheid dann ettlich seind beweglich, als die an seiten vnd vnder dem bauch stond, mit welchen sich die fisch bewegen mögen etlich seind vnbeweglich, durch welche die fisch ihren weg richten, vnd das wasser sich leichtlichen von einanderen theilet, so an dem rucken stohnd (264), Ich nenne dases ein gefider, so an einer linien sthet, wiewol deren an der zaal mehr seind (267), Auff dem rucken hatt ei ein gebeinen vnnd krospelechtigs gefider, so kein scharpff spitz hatt (276); Es haben . die Gamaren fünf gefider an dem schwantz (292); er hatt auff dem rucken lange vnnd auffgestreckte gefider, wie deß hanen schwantz ist. (299), Er hatt sechs gefider, on dases so an dem schwantz sthet (308); mit dem einigen gefider so er vff dem rucken hatt (313), wann er auch schwimmt, bewegt er sein gefider (314); Er hatt vier gefider, zwo lange vnnd breite an yetwederer seyten, so den schwalmen fluglen nit vngeleich zwey hatt er am rucken (323)

The *DWb* records *Gefieder* only of birds. Of interest is Pantaleon's statement (p. 264) that there are several kinds of fins, without any distinction in the name that is applied to them. On pp. 418 f., furthermore, there are five instances of the word *Gefider* applied to a sort of wing on a waterwheel. "wann aber das rad mit den pinnen oder gefider ein mal vmbfaret," but these do not concern us here.

* *Offenbarung der Natur vnnd Natürlicher dingen auch mancherly subtiler würckungen. Durch den hochgelerten Hieronymum Cardanum/Dootorn der arteney zu Meyland erstlich zu Latin außgangen . . . Alles durch Heinrich Pantaleon der artney Dootoren/zü gutem Teütscher nation/gantz fleissig vnd auff das treulichchest verteütschet. . . Basel 1559. 20 leaves, 934 pp., in folio. Copy in my possession.*

Most interesting for our purposes is the word *Fagden*, *Fegden*, used by Pantaleon to designate the wings of bees, butterflies, ants, and birds

Es verderbend die sommeruogel alle zû herbst zeytt vor altei, vnnd fallend jhnen die fegden ab (p 193), so hauwet man dem Kung die fagden ab, also behaltet man sie wider jhren willen da heimen (195), Wann der Kung mud worden, wolliches dann bald beschicht, weil sie gewonet da heimen zû beleiben, darzû kleine fagden, vnd ein groÿen leib habend (196), Wann einer ein hummel so keine fagden hatt hinein stosset, so nagen sie den anderen hummlen allen jhre fagden ab (1b), Wann vnser ameissen alt werdend, uberkommend sie fagden, doch fliegend sie nitt fast (199); sechs fuÿ, zwen dunne kurtze fagden, wolche den schwantz nitt bedeckend (202), Sy hatten zwen fuÿ, vnnd kleine fagden, also daÿ ich glaub sie haben kûmerlich fligen mûgen (204), die brust diser voglen ist gespitzet mit breitten fagden vnd schwantz (240), alle mit flecken vnnd sternleinen gezieret, fast wie der summer vûgeleinen fagden (323)

The ten instances of *Fagden* here cited are all in the plural two in the nominative, one in the dative, and seven in the accusative. The nominative singular could therefore be either *Fagde* or *Fagden*. The *DWb* does not record the word. It is safe to assume that *Fackten* and *Fagden* are slightly different manifestations of the same word, even though *Fackten* is used for the fins of fishes, and *Fagden* for the wings of bees, butterflies, ants, and birds. Still another form is *vechten*. "Do streich ein ar vber sie hin vnd sluc sie mit den vechten vnd stunt vor sie vf den wec" ³

In an attempt to explain the form *Fackten*, Grimm (*DWb* III, 1229) thinks first of *Fach*, 'Lappe, Fetze,' then of *Fachete*, 'Tasche,' then of *fackeln*, *feckeln*, 'flattern,' and, as a last possibility, states. "endlich konnte *fackten* umstellung von *fettich*, *fittich sein*, Frisius schreibt neben *facken* ohne weiteres *fatchen* und Maaler 129^a gar nicht anders mit den *fatchen* schweren, die *fatchen* erschutten, die *fatchen* erschwingen, plaudere als *tch* und *ck* tauschen leicht, unmittelbar nach labialen fällt aber *l* gern aus."

The idea of metathesis is strengthened by the forms *Fagden* and *vechten*, which were not known to Grimm. Further support can be

³ See "Der Veter Buch," p 62, 16, in *Bibl des Litt Vereins in Stuttgart*, vol. 72 (1863). This text, which may be as old as the thirteenth century, is preserved in a MS of the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century. In referring to this passage, Lexer (III, 331, under *vetach*) merely states. "vecht, pl. vechte," without giving the context. The nominative singular might just as well be posited as *vechten*.

found in Graff III, 449, where, under *Fedah*, the forms *fehthacha* and *fehthac* are listed. Both are in the accusative plural and translate *ascellas* of the Vulgate.⁴ Significantly enough, the manuscripts from which Graff cites the spellings *fehthacha* and *fehthac* are at St. Gall that is to say, as early as the eighth and ninth centuries the metathesis appears in Swiss texts. We can plausibly assume, therefore, that not only *vechten* of *Der Veter Buch* but also the forms *Fackten* and *Fagden* of sixteenth century texts are derived from *vetach*, *vetich*.

W. KURRELMMEYER

PYTHONISSA. FAUST II, L. 9135

In the third act of *Faust II* Helena after having been ushered into the courtyard of Faust's castle through the magic contrivance of Phorkyas-Mephistopheles looks in vain for that mysterious figure in whose power she finds herself. "Wo bist du, Pythonissa?" she exclaims (l. 9135). There has been no disagreement as to the meaning of the word, it signifies prophetess or sorceress, but various views have been expressed by commentators as to the source from which Goethe got the word. It is not found in the older German dictionaries and no example of the word in German has ever been cited antedating Goethe with one exception to be taken up later. Sanders gives the word with a reference to this *Faust* passage, so does Kehrein's *Fremdwörterbuch*. Kehrein also gives a reference to Gutzkow's *Der Zauberer von Rom* 1865. Goethe's use of the word in *Faust* introduced it to the German literary public.

According to Witkowski's *Faust* commentary (1936) Bishop Methodios of Olympos (fourth century) was the first to use the Greek word in the title of one of his writings in the sense of the Delphic Sibyl. It passed into Latin and French where 'pythonisse' signifies prophetess, sorceress. "Von dort hat es Goethe übernommen." This would mean that Goethe got it from the French. Trendelenburg (1921) calls it a Latin loan word from the Greek

⁴The passage in question must be *Lev.* 1, 17, as it is only here that *ascella* occurs in the Vulgate in the accusative plural. In *Matth.* 23, 37 the *Itala*, to be sure, has *ascellas*, but the Vulgate has *alias*. Luther translates *Flügel* in both cases.

"von Goethe dem französischen Pythonisse entlehnt" Erich Schmidt (Jubilaumsausgabe) calls the word 'mittellateinisch' Calvin Thomas (1897) says "Goethe seems to have got the form by taking the familiar Fr pythonesse (doubtless a misprint for pythonisse) and treating it as if it were Greek" Schroer (1881) explains Pythonissa as "neulateinische Bezeichnung einer Wahrsagerin für Pythia, so heissen die wahrsagenden Priesterinnen zu Delphi" Loeper (1879) comments "So heisst die wahrsagende Hexe von Endor im Lat Pythonissa Endorea ..franz Pythonisse" He quotes Goethe's letter to Bettina of Nov 3rd, 1809 in which he calls her 'eine holde Pythonisse.' The oldest Faustcommentator Duntzer explains the word in a way that has not been surpassed by any later commentator. *Goethes Faust*, 2nd ed Leipzig 1857, p 650 "Das neulateinische, ins Französische und Englische, auch ins MHD übergegangene Pythonissa bezeichnet eine Wahrsagerin, ein Weib, das einen Wahrsagergeist (Python, vgl 1 Sam. 28, 7, Apostelgeschichte 16, 16) hat" In his edition of *Faust* in the Deutsche Nationalliteratur he comments "mittellat Wahrsagerin, dann geradezu Zauberin. Auch die Hexe von Endor heisst so."

The use of Pythonissa in the sense of prophetess, sorceress in mediaeval and modern times goes back to the Vulgate, 1 Chron. x, 13. "Mortuus est ergo Saul propter iniquitates suas, eo quod praevaricatus sit mandatum Domini quod praeceperat, et non custodierit illud, sed insuper etiam pythonissam consuluerit." In chapter 28 of 1 Samuel, where the story of the witch of Endor is told, the word does not occur Saul says to his servants (v. 7) "quaerite mihi mulierem habentem pythonem . . et dixerunt servi ad eum Est mulier pythonem habens in Endor" The Authorized version renders 1. Chron x, 13 one that has a familiar spirit and 1 Sam. xxviii, 7 a woman that has a familiar spirit Luther has "die Wahrsagerin" and "ein Weib, die einen Wahrsagergeist hat" The pre-Lutheran German Bible has "die zoublerin" and "ein weib die do hab den zouberten geyst" The French Bible in the editions of Martin and Ostervald has as chapter heading of 1 Sam. xxviii "Saul consulte la Pythonisse," verse 7 reads "une femme qui a un esprit de Python." In 1. Chron x, 13 the French has: "et qu'il avait consulté l'esprit de Python."

Pythonisse became a current word in French. The Dictionary of the French Academy (8th ed., Paris, 1933) states under Pythonisse; "T. d'Antiquité. La pythie de Delphes et, par exten-

sion, toute femme qui fait métier de prédire l'avenir. La pythonisse d'Endor. Saul consulte la pythonisse Elle est allée consulter une pythonisse."

The word passed into English in the forms pythonissa and pythoness (with variants in the older language) The *NED*. gives citations extending from the 14th century to the 19th Many of them refer to the witch of Endor The *NED* also states that the word was often treated as the proper name of the witch of Endor Bayard Taylor uses pythoness in his translation of *Faust*, Miss Swanwick Pythonissa.

In German the word never passed into general usage Only one example has been recorded for MHG Lexer's *Mhd Wb* and Muller-Zarncke register "phitonissa vaticinatrix" with a reference to Oberlin 1223. The work referred to is J. G. Scherz's *Glossarium Medi Aevi* which was revised and edited by J. J. Oberlin, Strassburg 1781. Phitonissa is given on p. 1223 with a passage from a manuscript *Paraphrasis Poetica Veteris Testamenti* f 162. "unn fur ze Phitonisse der heidene prophetisse," doubtless a reference to the witch of Endor. The second reference given by Lexer, Diefenbach 237^b, is not Middle High German but mediaeval Latin.

Modern French-German and English-German dictionaries render French pythonisse and English Pythoness with 'Wahrsagerin, Zauberin,' never with 'Pythonissa.' Cf. among others the French-German dictionaries of Mozin (1856), Sachs-Villatte (1884), the English-German dictionaries of J. Ebers (1796-99, 1800, 1819), Bailey-Fahrenkruger (1801), J. L. Hilpert (1846), O. F. Grieb (1857 and later), Muret-Sanders (1899).

The word is used in the Latin witchcraft literature down to more recent times. The learned Dutch theologian Gisbert Voëtius in his *Disputationum Selectarum Pars II* (Utrecht 1654, p. 1058) speaks of two classes of people who prophesy or are possessed by the devil. "sunt autem illi duum generum aut qui volentes, ut Pythonici et Pythonissae, aut qui invitati talem diaboli agitationem patiuntur"

According to Johannes Praetorius, the great authority on witchcraft and popular superstitions of the seventeenth century, Pythonissa was a well known word in his time. In *Ander Theil der Neuen Weltbeschreibung* (Magdeburg 1667, p. 236) which is the continuation of his *Anthropodemonus Plutonicus, Das ist, Eine*

Neue Weltbeschreibung von allerley wunderbaren Menschen (Magdeburg 1666) he says

Der leufft zur Klugen Flauen, Die werden genennet Pythonissae, haben den Namen von dem Heidnischen Abgotte Apollo, der nachdem er die grausame Schlange Python getödtet, Pythius Apollo genennet wurde. Diesem wurde hernachmahls zu Delphos ein über ausz der Massen herrlicher Tempel erbauet, und weil man in dem selben etwas mehr als beyhm Hammon, oder Dodon, erfahren konte, als ist es dannenhero kommen, dass man in Gemein alle Kluge Männer, und Kluge Frauen, von denen man heimliche Dinge erforschen und erkundigen konte, Pythones und Pythonissae genennet

Praetorius' work was well known to Goethe who had made use of it for the *Walpurgisnacht*, as Witkowski¹ has clearly shown. Praetorius' *Blockes Berges Verrichtung* (Leipzig 1696) also furnished Goethe with material for the *Walpurgisnacht*. In this work Praetorius mentions Bernhard Waldschmid's *Pythomssa Endorea oder 28 Hexen- und Gespenst- Predigten* in two places (pp 99 and 143). Jocher's *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon* (Leipzig 1751) mentions this work under Waldschmid without giving place and date of publication. Waldschmid lived from 1608-1665. It may be assumed that Waldschmid² used Pythonissa also in the German text, not merely in the title.

The word is also found in Zedler's *Grosses Universal-Lexicon*, vol. 23, Leipzig and Halle, 1740. In the article on Necromantie we read "Dieser Wahrsager-Geist aber wird im Griechischen *πνεῦμα Πύθωνος* genennet, davon die Personen, die damit besessen waren, Pythonissen, oder Wahrsagerinnen heissen". The plural Pythonissen occurs several times in the article.

Paracelsus uses the word in the title of the second chapter of Tractatus quartus of his treatise *De Pestilente* "De incantationibus et pythonissis." The German text of the chapter uses only hexe, not pythonissa. Goethe refers to this work in the *Ephemerides* in abbreviated form "Tr. 4 de Pest." (Morris, *Der junge Goethe*

¹ Cf G Witkowski, *Die Walpurgisnacht im ersten Teile von Goethes Faust*, Leipzig 1894, pp 23 ff, also A Bartscherer, *Paracelsus, Paracelsisten und Goethes Faust* Dortmund 1911, p 79. Witkowski (p 26) and Bartscherer (p 79) also point out the influence of Praetorius' *Blockes Berges Verrichtung* upon the *Walpurgisnacht*.

² The book is not accessible to me. A Tille in *Die Faustsplitter in der Literatur des sechzehnten bis achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1900, p. 107 f cites five 'Faustsplitter' from Waldschmid's *Pythomssa Endorea*.

II, 30) Goethe's studies of Paracelsus have been discussed in detail by Agnes Bartscherer in *Paracelsus, Paracelsisten und Goethes Faust* Dortmund 1912 (cf p 94 on the treatise *De Pestilitate*), also in the essay *Magie und Zauberer im ersten Teil von Goethes Faust* in her *Zur Kenntnis des jungen Goethe*, Dortmund 1912

Paracelsus uses the masculine form in the German text of his *Philosophia de divinis operibus et secretis naturae* "so die ding nit vihisch werent, und sich die leut hielten im weg des hern, so konten die pythones und augures coeli die ding nicht anzeigen"³

Goethe did not have to go to the French for his Pythonissa which is the Latin form. He found it in Paracelsus, Praetorius and in the Latin witchcraft literature of the past. As Praetorius and Zedler show, it must have been used in German also, even though only a solitary MHG example has been recorded for the time before Goethe.⁴ Pythonissa meaning prophetic, sorceress is not found in classical Latin. Harper's Latin Dictionary lists it with the single reference to Vulgate, 1 Chron x, 13, which is not classical Latin. Nor is it found in classical Greek in this sense. Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Dictionary gives *Πυθωνισσα* as late Greek in the sense of ventriloquist. But Pythonissa suggests the classical Pythia and python. A mediaeval word with a classical background was a most fitting word to use in the Helena act with its fusion of the Classical and the Mediaeval.

Goethe's use of the form Pythonisse in his letter to Bettina Brentano, to which Loeper refers, may well go back to the French.

³Theophrast von Hohenheim gen. Paracelsus, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. K. Sudhoff, München and Berlin 1933, xiv, 66 f. The chapter heading from *De Pestilitate* is found xiv, 655

⁴After completing the article I came across three other examples of the word in German. Joseph Glanvill, *Saducismus Triumphatus*, Hamburg 1701, p 157: dass diese Pythonesse, eine *εγγαστριμβος* seynde, das ist ab utero vocem emittens. In the English original (London 1681) the passage reads (II 63) "That this Pythoness being a Ventriloque, that is speaking as it were from the bottom of her Belly. Petri Goldschmidts *Verworffener Heben- und Zauberer-Advocat*, Hamburg 1705, p 272. Der Geist Pythonis ist anders nichts als der wahrsagende Geist. Die Person oder die Wahrsagerinn, welche solchen Geist hatte, ward Pythonissa, oder ein Pytisch Weib . . . genannt. Don Ferdinand Sterzinger, *Geister und Zauberkatechismus*, München 1763, p. 20. Man stelle sich vor dass eben diese Pythonissa oder Wahrsagerin die Gabe gehabt, ohne den Mund zu öffnen, aus dem Bauch zu sprechen.

He writes "Denn wer liesse sich nicht von einer holden Pythonisse gern in jeden Irrthum fuhren Schreibe mir ob dir der Geist nicht sagt was ich meine."⁵

JOHN A. WALZ

Harvard University

AN UNPUBLISHED MHG VERSION OF PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN PROVERBS

A recent issue of *PMLA* (LVII, 627-32) contained an edition and discussion of a Latin and two MHG proverb collections of the fifteenth century. The territory, from which these three texts (L, A, B) derive, is Bavaria and the adjacent part of Swabia. In the following lines attention is called to another unpublished version, containing the same sayings in the same order, but originating from the Middle Franconian linguistic territory, situated diagonally opposite, in the Lower Rhine section.

This version is contained in MS 10 of the library of University College, London, and is mentioned in D. K. Coveney, *Descriptive Catalogue of MSS in the Library of University College, London*, 1935, p. 45. As can be seen from an explicit on fol. 46 vb, this MS. was written in 1456. Little can be ascertained respecting the provenance and history of this MS, except that it once had belonged to the Van Ess collection in Marburg, found its way into the Phillippica of Cheltenham (Nr 624) and was presented to University College in 1911 by Lord Crawford. It is not impossible that together with many other priceless MSS this, too, has recently become a war victim and been turned to ashes in a fire that swept the University library after a heavy bombing. The proverb collection is given on fol. 47 va and vb, where it is found between two theological treatises, the *Quatuor novissima* (1 ra-47 vb) and Isidor (49 ra-56 ra), having been used, like versions A and L, to fill the left-over space. The text is written on paper in two columns with the lines clearly visible. Each leaf measures 27,5 x 20,5 cm., the writing space 19,5 x 14 cm. Twenty letters to the line is the average. Throughout the manuscript the script is of the cursive type, except for the title (*Dit sijnt* . . .) which is in minuscule

⁵ G. von Loeper, *Briefe Goethes an Sophie von Laroche und Bettina Brentano*. Berlin 1879, p. 184.

script The initial letter 'H' is richly embellished and nearly three lines high The two down strokes of the letter 'w' reach far above the line and form a loop which resembles the letters 'lb' in cursive writing Nowhere, not even before rounded letters, does the crooked 'r' appear. The scribe is wont to place two dots over 'u,' without regard to whether it indicates the vowel or fricative sound, except in the case of the diphthongs 'au' and 'eu.' Nor does he distinguish carefully between 'ij' and 'y,' which latter never carries the dots However, MHG 'i' is generally rendered by 'y,' and MHG 'î' by 'ij' The nasal bar is used only twice There is only one correction (*decz* crossed out before */Decz* in the last saying), the nature of which suggests that the scribe has made a copying error The dialect of this version, as indicated by phonology and orthography, is unquestionably Middle Franconian.

In considering the relation between this version and the South German collections (A and B), a comparison marks it more closely related with A (cgm 105) than with B, as is apparent from the reading *Bis barmherczich*, which is contained only in A (9a: *pis barmherczig*), but not in B. Only insignificant are the differences in phraseology between A and the Middle Franconian collection (e g A: *aller sag* = MFr. *dat man dir sart*, A. *vnwiderpingerchem* = MFr. *des du nyet weder kriegen en kans*). There is only one marked difference in the text Reading Nr. 4 of A (*vnd pis nit ze schnell in raten* = L *ne sis velox loquendo*) corresponds to *Nyet en bis snel czo der czornichgeit* of the MFr. version, which in view of the immediately following saying *Snijdt vnczwey dijn en czorn* (L *vram scinde*) must be regarded as a deterioration of the text. This reading most probably was already present in the *Vorlage*. It is this corruption that warns us not to regard the MFr. version as a copy of A (cgm. 105), but rather as a separate version, descending like A and B, from a common source y.

Text:

Dit sijnt mirckliche leren De Arefstotales fande dem konynck Alexander

Hæll heymeliche dyngen / Sprich wenich. Bis wairafftich. Nyet en bis snel czo der czornichgeit. Snijdt vnczwey dijn en czorn. Wijgh dem kujë. En anezuich nyemant an fijnem geruichte. Huede dich van dem wijne. Gedencke czo fterüen. Bis barmherczich, Nyet en verfelle dich mit dem vnbekanten. Nyet en gelotüe snel dat man

dir fait Dynē verfwuendē vyant en gijff geyn gelouue. Van eynem verloren dyngē / des du nyet weder krijgen en kans en wils geyn drouffheit hauen Nyet en wils dich ervreuwen van vngelucke dijns nyesten. Nyet en wils dich schelden mit eynem der mechtiger is dan du Nummer en wils heymeliche sachen dijne huyffrauwen noch dynen kinderen offenbaren want die wijue ind die kinder verfwijgen / Des sij nyet en wyffen ze.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College of the City of New York

THE CHRONOLOGY OF DIDEROT'S JOURNEY TO LANGRES IN 1759

Much of the chronology of Diderot's life is still uncertain, making a thorough-going critical biography at present impossible. His own memory for dates and days of the week was notably inaccurate, so that he himself refers humorously to his amiable weakness in this respect.¹ Moreover, many of the letters in his published correspondence are undated, or have been dated vaguely or inaccurately by editors, even though a careful study of the letters themselves may permit the clearing up of not a few uncertainties. A small example in this connection is offered by the details of Diderot's return from his native town of Langres in August of 1759.

Diderot's father had died on Sunday, "jour de la Pentecôte,"² therefore on June 3, 1759, not on the 4th, as has been stated.³ Diderot received the news by the 9th on which date he mentions it in a letter to Grimm.⁴ Since it was already too late to attend the

¹ "Si c'est aujourd'huy jeudi, comme je crois, car je ne scais jamais bien le jour que je vis" (*Lettres à Sophie Volland*, Paris, 1930, I, 76.) Cf his inaccurate reference to his date of birth as October 2 (instead of the 5th) and to his age in 1776 as 63, 64, or 65, "que scais-je" (*Correspondance inédite*, Paris, 1931, I, 171.)

² *Correspondance inédite*, I, 43

³ By André Babelon, *ibid*, I, 42, note 2 The error is repeated by Hubert Gautier, *Le Père de Diderot*, Moulins, 1933, p 8 In 1759, Sunday fell on June 3, not June 4.

⁴ "Mon père est mort. Je ne scais ni quand ni comment" (*Correspondance inédite*, I, 42.)

funeral, Diderot waited for the completion of preliminary arrangements in the settlement of the estate, and at length left Paris for Langres on Wednesday, July 25, "entre dix et onze, à l'heure du jour la plus chaude et le jour de la saison le plus lourd."⁵ He slept that night at Nogent- [sur-Seine] and, making a long, hard journey the next day, arrived quite exhausted "à la porte de la maison entre minuit et une heure" early on the morning of Friday, the 27th.⁶ This is clear and definite. The details of the return journey, however, are confused.

After first fixing his departure for Monday, August 13, Diderot yielded to the urging of his brother and sister to remain a few more days.⁷ On Tuesday, August 14, the philosopher wrote both to Grimm and to Sophie Volland "J'ai encore deux nuits à passer ici. Jeudi matin, . . . de grand matin, je quitterai cette maison."⁸ Thus Diderot planned to leave Langres early on Thursday, August 16, and he did actually leave on this date, as we shall see. He had made the trip from Paris in a carriage lent by Mme Volland, the mother of Sophie "Sachez-vous comment je suis venu? Dans la chaise de la mère," he wrote to Grimm.⁹ On his return, he was therefore to go by way of Mme Volland's estate at Isle and from there accompany her back to Paris.¹⁰

A letter of Diderot to Sophie Volland written in part from Quémont, where he had stopped the first night after leaving Langres, bears the date, in the Assézat and in the Babelon editions,¹¹ of August 17. It is clear, however, from the text that the first half of this letter was written on the first evening out from Langres. If he did leave Langres on the 16th, as he had planned, then the first half of the letter was written from Quémont that same evening and only the last half on the 17th.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 59.

⁶ *Ibid.* "Je partis avant hier de Paris." The letter is dated "Langres, ce 27 juillet 1759." In a letter to Mme Diderot, he wrote "J'ai fait un voyage très pénible. . . . Je suis arrivé ici si changé, si défait qu'Hélène [la domestique] disoit que j'étois venu me faire enterrer à côté de mon père." (*Ibid.*, II, 237.)

⁷ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, I, 66.

⁸ *Correspondance inédite*, I, 68. Cf. *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, I, 68.

⁹ *Correspondance inédite*, I, 61.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Œuvres complètes* (Assézat ed.), XVIII (Paris, 1876), 378; *Lettres à Sophie Volland* (Babelon ed.), I, 70 (Paris, 1930).

Me voilà à Guémont, c'est de là que je vous écris avec la plume du curé Demain à Joinville, de bonne heure, à Saint-Dizier, à dîner, de Saint-Dizier à Isle, s'il se peut, dans le même jour, ou samedi dans la matinee, si c'est aujourd'hui jeudi, comme je crois Il est à peu près dix heures du soir ¹³

The next day Diderot contained in the same letter.

Me voilà hors de ce village appelle Guémont Je n'y ai pas fermé l'œil Des bêtes, je ne sçais quelles, m'ont mangé toute la nuit, nous en sommes sortis à six heures, pas plus tôt ¹⁴

After this miserable night, he says "Nous avons rafraîchi à un village appelé Lachecourt" ¹⁴ If Sophie were only at Isle, he would arrive, he says, that evening, but, since she is not, "je coucherai sûrement à Vitri ou ailleurs. . . Demain, je serai au lever de madame votre mère." ¹⁵ Then suddenly Diderot awakes to a characteristic error. He writes

J'allois faire une bonne sottise Je croyois qu'il falloit passer à Vitri au sortir de Saint-Dizier, et point du tout Je suis à la porte de la maison, dans deux heures d'ici, je parlerai à votre mère ¹⁶

In his next letter to Sophie, Diderot wrote "Il étoit à peu près six heures lorsque la chaise est entrée dans l'avenue" ¹⁷ In a letter to the Caroillon family after his return to Paris, Diderot stated, however, that he arrived "sur les quatre heures," ¹⁸ probably a slight lapse of memory since he had previously written to Sophie the next day after the event that "le soleil étoit tombé," ¹⁹ shortly after his arrival.

Now this letter to Sophie Volland is dated August 23 in the published editions. ²⁰ It was written from Isle at the country place of Mme Volland Diderot remained there, as he wrote to Grimm, "un jour et demi." ²¹ In his letter to Sophie, Diderot continues:

¹³ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, I, 76

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 77 In Assézat (xviii, 383), this passage is printed as the beginning of a separate letter and is dated August 19

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 78-79

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 80

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Correspondance inédite*, II, 213.

²⁰ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, I, 81

²¹ Assézat-Tourneux, xviii, 386, the latter half (p 390) being dated August 25, Babelon ed., I, 80

²² *Correspondance inédite*, I, 70.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, JANUARY, 1944

Nous sommes rentrés un peu tard Nous nous sommes couchés de bonne heure Demain à Châlons, ou M Le Gendre nous attend, et mecredi, dans la matinée, je l'espère, à Paris ²²

He adds:

Demain, nous irons nous emmuser à Vitry, et passer le reste du jour dans l'habitation de la chère sœur ²³

Thus, on Sunday, the 19th, they were to attend mass at Vitry- [le-François], before going on for the rest of the day and the night to Châlons where lived the son-in-law and the daughter of Mme Volland, M and Mme Le Gendre.

Thus, if we count the days, it is clear that Diderot did leave Langres early on Thursday, August 16. He stayed that night at Quémont and arrived at Isle late in the afternoon of Friday, the 17th. After "un jour et demi" at Isle, he departed with Mme Volland on Sunday, the 19th, in time for mass at Vitry before going on to Châlons in the afternoon. The letter to Sophie Volland, which until now has been dated the 23rd, was written therefore on Saturday, the 18th, a day after his arrival and the day before his departure.

These conclusions are confirmed by a very definite letter to the Carouillon family written after Diderot's arrival at Paris. This letter has been dated by M. Babelon as of "septembre 1759." ²⁴ It was written, however, as will presently appear, on Friday, August 24. In this letter, Diderot gives succinctly the details of his return journey from Langres to Paris.

Nous voilà arrivés dans la grande ville . . . Nous allâmes le premier jour coucher à Guémont, deux petites lieues au delà de Vignoi [Vignory]. Le second dîner à Saint-Disier, et coucher à Isle où nous arrivâmes sur les quatre heures. C'étoit l'endroit où je devois prendre la personne que je m'étois engagé de ramener à Paris. Nous passâmes dans son château qui est très beau le reste du jour, le jour suivant, et nous n'en partîmes que le dimanche matin que nous allâmes entendre la messe à Vitry, d'où nous gagnâmes Châlons. Nous arrivâmes à Châlons sur les trois heures . . . Le lundi nous reprîmes notre route, et nos douze lieues faites, nous nous arrêtâmes à Dormans. La journée du mardi fut la plus longue. Il y a quatorze lieues de Dormans à Maux, nous y arrivâmes cependant de bonne heure, parce que nous quittâmes Dormans de grand

²² *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, I, 84-85.

²³ *Ibid.*, I, 87.

²⁴ *Correspondance inédite*, II, 213.

matin De Maux à Paris, il y a dix petites heures que nous avons faites à notre aise, et nous avons revu la grande ville le mercredi d'assez bonne heure.²⁵

Diderot arrived in Paris, therefore, on Wednesday, August 22.

Since the horses borrowed from the Caroillon family were to rest "jusqu'à lundi,"²⁶ this letter, dated by Diderot "ce vendredi,"²⁷ must have been written on August 24, two days after his arrival, and should be so dated.

Thus, in addition to the clarification of the chronology of Diderot's return from Langres, we are now able to correct the dating of three letters.

To Sophie Volland (Assézat-Tourneux, XVIII, 378, 383, Babelon, I, 70-80), August 16-17, instead of the 17th, as in Babelon, or the 17th and 19th, as in Assézat-Tourneux.

To Sophie Volland (Assézat-Tourneux, XVIII, 386, 390, Babelon, I, 80-89), August 18, instead of the 23rd, as in Babelon, or the 23rd and 25th, as in Assézat-Tourneux.

To the Caroillon family (*Correspondance inédite*, II, 213-215), August 24, 1759, not September

GEORGE R. HAVENS

Ohio State University

VICTOR HUGO ET DELILLE

Le hasard nous a fait lire—eh! oui, pour la première fois—les quatre chants du long poème de Delille, et ses 'notes,' surtout ses 'notes'. *La pitié, Poème*, avec figures (Paris, chez Giguet et Michaud, 1805—An XIII, 236 pp. in 12). . Et, du fond de notre mémoire est surgie la figure de l'auteur des *Misérables*, mieux de l'auteur de *La pitié suprême*, bien mieux encore de l'auteur des royalistes et catholiques *Odes et Poésies*. En même temps, un vague souvenir d'avoir lu, dans le *Conservateur littéraire* de Victor Hugo et ses amis (1819-1821) quelques pages sur Delille, signées V. II fallait voir.

Et voici, en effet, la teneur de l'article de Victor Hugo (cf. Éd. de Jules Marsan, "Soc des Textes mod.", Hachette, 1922, II, I, pp. 18-27) lequel était suivi dans la même 'Livraison (6),' d'un autre,

²⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 213-214.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 214

²⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 215.

évidemment inspiré par celui de Hugo. "Notice particulière sur l'inhumation de Jacques Delille" pp 29-32, signé L. D. A. (Lafont d'Aussone) Il s'agit d'un compte-rendu assez détaillé des *Œuvres posthumes* de Delille qui venaient de paraître. En général, dit V, il faut se méfier des *Œuvres posthumes*; on y met des fonds de tiroirs, et, en les publiant, on rend mauvais service à l'auteur qu'on se proposait d'honorer. C'est ici un peu le cas pour Delille, mais c'est une occasion d'évoquer le souvenir d'un écrivain dont le nom mérite de vivre. D'ailleurs, ces deux volumes offrent des passages "où l'on retrouve encore l'imagination du peintre des *Jardins*, l'âme du chantre de *La Pitié*, et toutes les qualités poétiques de l'interprète de Virgile." Et, plus bas, le futur auteur de *La pitié suprême* ajoute: "Delille se fit le père de la poésie descriptive, [mais] nous préférons les vers si touchants de *La pitié* sur les malheurs de la famille royale à toutes les descriptions . . .". Enfin, et ceci est encore particulièrement intéressant sous sa plume, l'auteur des *Odes* choisit pour l'exalter surtout dans ces *Œuvres posthumes*, un passage où Delille, dans un 'Discours sur l'Éducation' (prononcé à Amiens, en 1766) sort de son sujet pour prononcer un superbe éloge du "grand dauphin", c'était sur la noblesse et la loyauté de celui-ci que toute la France comptait pour réparer les fautes du règne de Louis XV, "le prince chéri et trop tôt enlevé à l'amour de la France . . ." Et Victor Hugo d'ajouter: ce "grand dauphin . . . semblait avoir été inspiré par les mêmes vertus que notre Duc de Berry"; l' "Ode au Duc de Berry" (13 février, 1820) venait à peine de sortir de presse.

Ces vertus royales vont être, dans les années suivantes, celles que Victor Hugo ne cessera d'exalter dans ses *Odes et poésies*. Et si, sans doute, c'est de Chateaubriand que Hugo s'inspire pour les événements politiques des années de la Restauration, 1820-25 (sur 'La mort du Duc de Berry,' 'Les funérailles de Louis XVIII,' les deux 'Odes sur le Duc de Bordeaux,' et autres épisodes), ce serait chez Delille que l'on pourrait chercher un précurseur quand il s'agit d'épisodes des années d'avant la Restauration, sur le martyre de la famille royale, le roi, la reine, le dauphin, sur Mlle de Sombreuil, les massacres de la Vendée, les vierges de Verdun, sans compter des thèmes impersonnels comme l'horreur pour la Révolution.

Il ne peut y avoir aucun doute, si l'on veut bien se rapporter aux mentions si élogieuses de *La pitié*, et au fait que V. Hugo exprime si nettement sa préférence pour ce poème aux morceaux contenus dans les *Œuvres posthumes*, que l'auteur des *Odes* avait lu avec

beaucoup d'attention *La pitié*. Il est vrai que 'La Vendée' est de 1818, et 'Quiberon' de la fin de 1819, c. à d. un peu avant la parution de la 6^{me} livraison du *Conservateur littéraire* au début de 1820; mais il est évident que la lecture de *La pitié* avait dû antédater celle des *Œuvres posthumes*. Encore une fois nous voudrions attirer l'attention sur les très abondantes "Notes" de Delille, surtout au Chant III concernant les circonstances historiques des martyrs de la cause royaliste.

Dira-t-on que ces thèmes étaient en quelque sorte du domaine public, et que, tout simplement, Delille et V. Hugo ont puisé à cette même source du martyrologe royal? Peut-être; mais il semble bien, cependant, que Delille, lequel était alors encore une force dans le monde des lettres, ait contribué à fixer en quelque sorte les traits essentiels de la légende, et que V. Hugo, qui alors prenait encore son bien d'ailleurs, ait bénéficié par l'inspiration de son prédécesseur—avant de l'éclipser devant la postérité.

A remarquer que V. Hugo, en 1834, quand il prépara *Histoire et Philosophie mêlées*, abandonna l'article sur Delille, sauf une centaine de mots de la fin, et où il n'est pas question de Delille.

Il doit être bien entendu qu'il ne s'agit pas ici de faire œuvre de "sourcier." Qu'on ne nous prête même pas la sotte idée d'avoir voulu arracher une feuille de la couronne de V. Hugo pour en orner celle de Delille; Hugo n'avait besoin de personne pour lui suggérer l'idée de proclamer les vertus de la pitié comme un baume aux souffrances de la pauvre humanité. Seulement nous serions assez disposé aujourd'hui à réserver à Delille une petite place parmi ceux qui ont contribué à la formation de V. Hugo, surtout du jeune Hugo—aux pieds du trône de Chateaubriand qui demeure naturellement le grand inspirateur des premières années,¹ entre les deux fauteuils de Nodier et de Sainte-Beuve, un tout modeste tabouret.

Nous ne croyons pas que ce fût par un pur hasard que ces deux poètes qui avaient exprimé chacun à sa manière la poésie de leur siècle, aient fini tous deux par chanter d'une façon si insistante cette pitié totale pour la souffrance, celle qui couvre, avec le pécheur par faiblesse ou par ignorance, le méchant qui se révolte délibérément contre l'ordre divin, les Lucifer et les Satan.

ALBERT SCHINZ

Philadelphia

¹ Voir Biré et surtout Ganser, *Beiträge zur Beurtheilung der Verhältnisse V. Hugo's zu Chateaubriand*, Heidelberg, 1900, 120 pp.

TWO OLD ENGLISH TEXTUAL ERRORS

I

ADVERBIA beoð gelimplicor geendebyrde gif hi standað on foreweardan on ðære spræce . man mot hi eac bæftan settan butan þam ðe beoð anes stæfgefeges oððe æteowigendlice oððe *astigendlice* oððe tihtendlice oððe gelicnysses ðas sceolon æfre standan on foreweardre spiæce

The passage comes from Aelfric's *Grammar* as edited by Julius Zupitza.¹ The spelling *astigendlice* occurs also in Somner's text,² but MS J omits oððe æteowigendlice oððe *astigendlice*, and Zupitza gives the additional variants *ast(i)g- C*, *astigen[dlic]he W*. Presumably the other MSS read *astigendlice* too, but it is clear that some of the scribes were baffled by the word.

On the basis of this unique occurrence an adjective *astigendlic* was entered³ in the Supplement to Clark Hall's *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Third Edition, Cambridge, 1931) with a Modern English equivalent 'intensive'. This meaning in a way satisfies the technical requirements of the passage, since 'intensives,' it is true, are preposed, and Aelfric's illustrative examples lack definiteness. Consider, however, the following statement by Priscian:

De ordine quoque adverbiorum quaeritur, utrum praeponi an supponi verbis aptius possint et manifestum est quod aptius quidem praeponuntur . . licet tamen tam haec quam illa praepostere proferre, exceptis monosyllabis quidem omnibus . . demonstrativa quoque et *interrogativa* praeponuntur verbis . . similiter hortativa.

If it be the source⁴ which Aelfric, in his own way, was somewhat infelicitously paraphrasing, the Latin counterpart of *astigendlice*

¹ Julius Zupitza, *Aelfrics Grammatik und Glossar* (Berlin, 1880), p. 241, ll. 9-15. I have removed Zupitza's accents, altered the punctuation a bit, and added the italics.

² William Somner, *Aelfrici . . Grammatica Latino-Saxonica* (Oxford, 1659), p. 42, ll. 23 ff.

³ Perhaps at the suggestion of Max Förster; see Hall's explanatory note, p. 433. Other dictionaries omit.

⁴ *Prisciani Institutionum Grammaticarum*, Liber xv, 39, ed. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* (Leipzig, 1858), III, 89, 14-23. Again I add italics. A little later in the paragraph Aelfric borrows from Donatus *Ars Minor*, but for our passage he probably used Priscian. Since he carefully restricts monosyllables to the word *O*, there may have been some confusion in Aelfric's mind between letters and syllables.

is plain enough. Elsewhere in the discussion of adverbs he translates *demonstrativa* with *æteowigendlice* (cf. Zupitza's edition, p 231, l 5), *hortativa* with *tichtendlice* (*ibid.*, p 227, l 16), and more than once offers the explanation, *interrogativa synd aæigendlice* (*ibid.*, p 231, l 9, compare further, p. 113, l 16, p 260, l 14).

So *astigendlice* must be a scribal blunder for *ascigendlice*,⁵ and a brand-new ghost-word haunts the latest, in many respects the best, of our Old English dictionaries. But the ease of confusion between *c* and *t* will be understood by everybody, and the "common error" hardly proves anything about the kinship of the manuscripts

II

At Matthew xix 25 the Corpus MS of the West Saxon Gospels reads *hwa mæg þis gehealdan*. MS H has *þys* and *gehealden*, but neither Skeat nor Bright supplies variants from MSS ABRo

While the Old English makes sense as 'Who may save this?' it is not much of a translation for the Latin *Quis ergo poterit salvus esse*. We might understand an emendation like *hwa mæg þis gehealden* [beon] in terms of a parallel rendering *swa hwa swa wile gehealden beon*, which the Lambeth Psalter provides for *Quicumque vult salvus esse*.⁶ Something, at any rate is amiss, for *gehealdan* cannot be passive by itself

The non-West Saxon versions of Matthew help us to surmise what else may have gone wrong, cf. *hwa forðon mæg hal wosa* Li, *hwa þonne mæg hal beon* Ru.¹ Again, in corresponding passages, all the West Saxon MSS read properly together *hwa mæg hal beon*, Luke xviii 26, *hwa mæg beon hal*, Mark x 26. It looks as if the verse in Matthew has been corrupted from a reading akin to these. The form *þis*, conceivably an instrumental 'in this way' (= *ergo*?), would spring from *þus* or from a blurred abbreviation such as *þoñ*, and *gehealdan* from an illegible (*ge*)*hal beon*, in which only a few letters could be made out

In either event the text is bad, and because they share the error all the West Saxon MSS must belong to the same family, just as

⁵ See Hall under *ascigendlic*, *ascian*, Bosworth Toller under *awendlic*, *awian*. For adjectives in *-endlic*, cf. also L. K. Shook, "A Technical Construction in Old English," *Medieval Studies*, II (1940), 253-57

⁶ Uno Lindelöf, *Der Lambeth-Psalter* (Helsingfors, 1909), Hymn 15, Verse 1, cf. Bosworth-Toller, *Suppl.*, under *gehealdan*. Other Psalters have *hal wesan* or the like

Skeat argued. Now we can go a step farther than he did. Since it is hard to believe that the translator would let such a mistake pass, we have reason to suppose that Skeat's "Original MS (now lost)" was indeed a copy, and that at least one intermediary stood between our extant texts and their prototype.⁷

HOWARD MERONEY

State Teachers College, Fredonia, New York

ENGLISH *SHEER* (OFF)

The *New English Dictionary* defines *sheer* (v²) as follows

Sheer, v², *Naut* (Perh a use of *shear* v, but the development in sense is obscure.)

1 *intr.* Of a ship To turn aside, alter its direction, swerve to either side of its course, in obedience to the helm. Chiefly with advs as *off*, *out*, *away*

b) To swerve to either side irregularly or unsteadily, not in obedience to the helm. Also with *around*

c) *transf* and *fig* Chiefly with *off* To change one's course, to depart, to go away, to go off in a new direction or on another 'tack'

2 *trans.* To cause (a vessel) to *sheer*, to direct (a vessel) obliquely towards a given point

The *NED*. points out that lexicographers have too readily identified our word with a homonym *shear* whose sense is 'to cut, divide, pierce, cleave, carve' and whose etymon is a Teutonic *scheren* (Middle Eng *sheren*, *scheren*). "The correspondance between the senses (of *sheer*) and the Germanic and Dutch senses (of *scheren*) is not sufficiently exact to warrant the assumption that the course of development has been parallel" (*NED*)¹

We are justified, it seems, in seeking a different source for the word. This source readily presents itself. Latin possessed a verb *exerrare* (v. n.) 'to wander away, to deviate, to err.' Lineal descendants of L. *exerrare* are limited in the Romance territory to

¹ See the stemma, p x, and the attendant remarks in the Preface to Skeat's edition of Saint Luke

² Ernest Weekley (*Eng Etym. Dict*, 1921) furnishes a good example of vague and inconsequential argument. He says of *sheer* "Verb, accidental spelling of *shear* 'to divide,' used to indicate a slanting course."

France.² Godefroy³ cites a series of Old French texts containing *esserrer* (L *exerrare*) and variant forms, all from eastern France (Wallonie, Lorraine, Franche-Comté). Its sense is intr. *errer*, *s'égarer*, *s'ecarter*, trans. *mener hors de la voie*. It has maintained itself in present day patois of the east. The *FEW* (*exerrare*) lists these patois forms which have preserved meanings close to the etymological one, such as '*dévier, se tromper, égarer, s'égarer, dévoyer, désorienter, perdre le Nord, surtout dans les bois, dans les neiges.*'⁴

But L. *exerrare* is also represented in O. Prov. *eissarrar*, *icharrar*. Only past participial forms are found in the texts, and Levy (*Prov. Suppl. Worterbuch*, II, 329) interprets them as 'in Bedrangnis, in Verlegenheit, unschlüssig'. One of the passages is interesting, for the word in it is associated with things nautical, a usage which has been considered to be the fundamental one of English *sheer*. We give here the second stanza of a poem of Sordello which contains it.⁵

- 17 E pos guida 'l ferm' estela lusens
las naus que van perilhan per la mar,
ben degra m' cilh qu' l sembla, guidar,
qu' en la mar sui per leis profundamens
21 ian *eyssaratx*, destreitz et esbaitz,
que i serai mortz, anz que'n hiesca, e peritz,
si no'm secor, qu'ieu non trueb a l'yssida
riba ni port, gua ni pont ni guerida

In the text *eyssaratx* (v. 21) seems to have been suggested by the nautical figure of a ship off its course just as its variant in another manuscript *esvaratz* 'tossed about' was. It may then be a nautical term with the literal meaning of the word.

The earliest instance of *sheer* (v.²) cited by the *NED*. is of 1626 and the word, in the several seventeenth century texts cited, does apply to ships. After 1704 we have examples of the more general sense, called by the *NED* "*transf. and fig.*," but one nevertheless always close to that of L. *exerrare* and its French descendants.

² Cf. W. Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Etym. Wörterb.* 3005.

³ F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français*, III, 570c.

⁴ W. v. Wartburg, *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, III, 292. Cf. also *Romania*, XXXIII, 22, A. Thomas, *Nouveaux essais de philologie française*, 2.5 f., who explains the Provençal forms.

⁵ Cf. C. De Lollis, *Vita e poesie di Sordello di Gorto*, 1896, p. 177; C. Appel, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie* (3rd ed.), p. 72.

The *English Dialect Dictionary* of Wright reports *sheer* (variants *shear*, *shere*, *share*) as being in general dialectal and colloquial use in Scotland and England. It gives examples ranging from the North Country and Yorkshire to London and Cornwall and defines it as 1) *v* with *off* to depart, to move off, swerve, turn aside, 2) *sb* a swerve, a lurch. Not one of the cases listed from the various regions refers to ships.⁶

In spite of the fact that the earliest examples of *sheer* recorded refer to ships, it is reasonable to suppose that this technical, nautical sense grew out of the general meaning of the L. verb, which was continued in Old French, which exists today in the French patois, which is observed in English texts after 1704, and is the only one noted by Wright in modern English dialects. The restriction to technical application of a word of earlier general meaning is a very common phenomenon of semantics and this has been especially true of terms of law, agriculture, the army and the navy.⁷

Sheer must have come into Anglo-French from some region in eastern France since L. *exerare* seems to have had descendents only there, to judge by the evidence of medieval texts and the modern patois. Such medieval variants of *esserrer* as *exerrer*, *esxerrer*, *exserrei*, *axerrer*, in which *x* = *š*, indicate a palatalization of the sibilant of the prefix, characteristic of eastern dialects.⁸ The popular pronunciation of the form imported into Anglo-French may then have already had the palatal *š*. The aphesis of initial *e* in Middle English, whether in the case of the prefix *es* (*er*) or the prosthetic *e*, before consonants and consonant groups, is a common phenomenon. The development of *ě* > *ē* (*ēē*) is normal. It may be,

⁶ Here are a few characteristic examples. He *sheer'd* off t'rroad; He *shaired* off t' toddher seid of street; I did not like his looks a bit and *sheered* off.

⁷ Cf. K. Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, iv, § 123, § 226. With reference to French he says: Le langage technique des marins se sert des mots appartenant à la langue commune. He gives a number of examples. A curious case is *flotte* which meant first in a general sense "une réunion de personnes ou d'objets de même nature." Since the sixteenth century it has come to mean almost exclusively "une réunion de navires." English *warp* originally meant 'throw.' It has acquired several technical meanings including that of the manoeuvring of a ship in port.

⁸ Cf. Schwan Behrens, *Grammaire de l'ancien français*, I, p. 149; II, p. 101.

however, that the palatalization of the sibilant took place in England cf. *ashlar*, ME *ascheler*, OF. *asseher* (L *axilla*, *axis*), *issue* from a past part of OF, *eissir*, *issir* (*eissue*, XII century, Marie de France), *sewer* (L *ex* + *aqua*) which as late as the XVIII c. had a variant pronunciation with *š*

It is entirely natural that *sheer* should come to be used habitually with adverbs *off*, *out*, *away*, since the portion of the word representing *ex* had been reduced to *š* which no longer suggested the etymological sense of *off*, *out*, *away*

In *sheer* (v.²) 'to turn away, etc' (L *exerrare*) and in *shear* (v.) 'to cut, etc' (Teut. *scheren*) we have one more example of homonymic pairs of words of different origin, of which there are said to be more than 700 in English. The penetration of *exerrare* into England has not before been pointed out

CHARLES H LIVINGSTON

Roudon College

CHAUCER'S KNIGHT AND THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR

Roger S Loomis in an article entitled "Was Chaucer a Laodicean?" remarks that "the ideal knight as depicted by Chaucer had devoted his military career, incidentally perhaps to 'his lordes werre,' wherever that may have been, but mainly and specifically to fighting for our faith against the heathen on all fronts."¹ This emphasis, Professor Loomis would have us believe, was a deliberate protest against the Hundred Years' War and indicates Chaucer's pacifism where all but holy wars were concerned

This emphasis may have been deliberate—but probably for artistic reasons rather than for reasons of doctrine. Following the portrait of the Knight is that of the Squire who had fought

In Flaundres, in Artoys, and Pycardie,

provinces of "cristendom" in which, we must assume, the Knight also fought, since the Squire served him.² It would have been

¹ *Essays and Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown* (New York: New York Univ Press, 1940), pp 136-37.

² As carver at the very least. Probably as shield- and armor bearer, too, since he was the Knight's only attendant

awkward to insert these placenames in both portraits, particularly since Chaucer evidently wanted us to think of the Knight and the Squire in their medieval relationship of warrior and attendant. Apparently Chaucer did what an accomplished poet might be expected to do, he indicated that the Knight had seen action

As wel in cristendom as in hethenesse,

enumerating the heathen battles at once and reserving the expeditions against the French until describing his squire. Thus he avoided repetition and made a clever and artistic link between the two portraits. It is hard, therefore, to see that the description of the Knight, connected as it is so closely to that of the Squire, indicates a doctrine that "coincides with the doctrine of Wyclif on the subject of war."³

Professor Loomis' argument can also be attacked on another ground—that of logical inconsistency. His premise would seem to be that when Chaucer's idealism does not correspond with fourteenth century reality, we may take the poet to be criticizing some aspect of the period. Thus, since the ideal Knight has supposedly fought chiefly in holy wars, the national war with the French—the greatest military reality of the day—receives Chaucer's disapprobation. But Professor Loomis does not use his major premise when he comes to the Plowman's portrait. This portrait has an important bearing upon the rebellious peasant, but, says Professor Loomis, "Chaucer's references to . . . the Peasants' Revolt are purely casual, and indicate no attitude whatsoever."⁴ Incidentally, he does not comment upon the contemptuous reference in the *Nun's Priest's Tale* to "Jakke Straw and his meynee" (CT, B² 4584), or to the fact that in the *Knight's Tale* the Peasants' Revolt is associated with the evil results of Saturn's influence:

The murmur and the cherles rebellyng

The groynynge, and the pryvee empoysonyng (CT, A2459-60)

He prefers to think that Chaucer is silent in regard to the rebellion of 1381, and that this "silence" was due to his recognizing, "as a humanitarian and a just man," that "where there was much wrong on both sides, there was no obligation to offer his career as a vain sacrifice to the cause of the oppressed."⁵ And about the

³ Loomis, *op cit.*, p. 137.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

Plowman specifically Professor Loomis has this to say "... surely it is little short of amazing that, writing the General Prolog within six years of the Peasants' Revolt, this poet of the court should sketch for us a representative peasant, the Plowman, not as a loafer, a scamp, a bolshevik, a sower of class hatred, but as a model of all the social and Christian virtues"⁶ Why does Professor Loomis not argue that since the typical (i e., the real) peasant contemporary with Chaucer was in contemporary eyes lacking in the social and Christian virtues, therefore "The poet's evident affection for the ideal peasant suggests an antagonism toward the actual peasant?"⁷

Professor Loomis does well to turn to the *Melbee* as an indication of the mature Chaucer's disapproval of the Hundred Years' War,⁸ but his comment upon the Knight (that Chaucer disapproved of all but holy war) breaks down when we consider Knight and Squire together, and the premise (that Chaucer's idealism is critical of conditions when the reality is far different from the idealism) might better have been applied to the Plowman.

GARDINER STILLWELL
HENRY J. WEBB

Ohio State University
Illinois Institute of Technology

WAS ROBYN THE MILLER'S YOUTH MISSPENT?

Two narrations among the *Canterbury Tales* are presented as actual events in which the teller played an actual part, the Prologue of the Wyf of Bath and the first part of the Tale of the Canon's Yeoman.¹ In the Prologue to yet a third tale the Miller declares:

⁶ *Ibid*

⁷ Gardiner Stillwell, "Chaucer's Plowman and the Contemporary English Peasant," *ELH*, vi (No 4, December, 1939), 285-90 This paper develops the statement here quoted from it

⁸ Loomis, *op cit*, pp 136, 137

¹ The Cook promises a true story, though it never becomes apparent whether he is to play a part; see lines 4340-43; this and all subsequent

For I wol telle a legende and a lyf
 Bothe of a carpenter and of his wyf,
 How that a clerk hath set the wrightes cappe,³

and from these words Osewold the Reeve seems to grasp the very nature of the yet untold story, for he cries out

It is a synne and eek a greet folye
 To apeyren any man, or hym defame,
 And eek to bryngen wyves in swich fame⁵

Why should Osewold be so knowing, and why can the Miller retort

I have a wyf, pardee, as wel as thou,⁶

unless these two be old acquaintances, and unless the Reeve realize that Robyn and Miller knows what happened in Osewold's—that is, John the carpenter's⁵—house one dark night some time before? And if the Miller were telling of an actual happening, how could he have known the intimate details so well? Could he, like Alice of Bath and like the Canon's Yeoman, have played a part in the stirring events of his own story?

There is one figure in the Miller's Tale who might be identified with the teller himself Robyn, the knave of John the Carpenter. The Miller, to be sure, is addressed as Robyn only once, but he was thus named, significantly enough, in his own Prologue, when Harry Bailey tried to postpone his tale

And seyde, "Abyd, Robyn, my leeve brother,
 Som bettre man shal telle us first another"⁶

If Robyn the Miller had spent part of his youth in the employ of the carpenter, he could have had inside information regarding the events in question. To be sure, Robyn the knave and Gille the mayde were dispatched to London before that fatal night,⁷ but

references are to *Canterbury Tales* I (A), in F. N. Robinson (ed.), *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, etc., 1933)

³ 3141-43

⁵ 3146-48

⁶ 3158.

⁵ This change of name, one must presume, is matched by a change of locale, unless we are to believe that Osewold, though now of Northfolk (see line 619), had previously lived in Oxenford.

⁶ 3129-30.

⁷ 3555-58, 3630-32

this deprivation, we may assume, served only to spur on Robyn's subsequent assembling of eye-witness accounts not only from the protagonists but also from Gerveys the smyth and the neighebores, bothe smale and grete.

The name of the carpenter's servant is not the only feature which tends to support this identification. In the General Prologue we are told that

The Millere was a stout carl for the nones,⁸

and in the Miller's Tale we learn (in reference to the carpenter) that

His knave was a strong carl for the nones⁹

Furthermore, we are told of the Miller that

Ther was no dore that he nolde heve of harre,¹⁰

whereas in the Miller's Tale, when hendy Nicholas has locked himself in his room, the carpenter says

Get me a staf, that I may underspore,
Whil that thou, Robyn, hevest up the dore

No sooner said than done

His knave was a strong carl for the nones,
And by the haspe he haaf it of atones;
Into the floor the dore fil anon¹¹

Those of Chaucer's contemporaries for whom the portraits, links, and tales proved especially vivid may have been led to believe that Robyn the Miller was none other than Robyn the knave of his own Tale, and that yet again a narrator was portrayed as recounting events in which he had played an actual part. If Chaucer intended such an interpretation, a further reason for the strange and splendid ire of the Reeve is added to the pitiful excuse that he was a carpenter.¹²

ROBERT A. PRATT

Queens College, New York

⁸ 545

⁹ 3469

¹⁰ 550.

¹¹ 3465-66, 3469-71

¹² 3859-63, 3913-15.

CLICHÉS AND THEIR SOURCES

Eric Partridge's *Dictionary of Clichés*¹ contains much interesting and useful material, but in his "Introductory Essay" Partridge runs into the common difficulty of defining a cliché. When a cliché is defined as "a stereotyped expression, a commonplace phrase" (*NED*) it becomes difficult to determine when a useful idiomatic expression becomes a cliché and should be avoided. Many of the phrases which Partridge lists as clichés seem rather to be useful idioms, far from outworn, and he omits many expressions which are definitely hackneyed and overworked and which ought to be classed as clichés. Partridge adds a few American clichés, many more should be added.

In many cases, often using Benham's *Book of Quotations*² or the *NED*, Partridge endeavors to give the first or an early instance of the occurrence of the cliché, before giving the approximate date of the period during which that expression has been a cliché. He remarks ("Introductory Essay," p. 8) "The English quotation clichés are numerous. Many from the Bible have become so encrusted in the language that we remember they are Biblical only because of the archaic phraseology." Partridge himself omits or is unaware of the Biblical sources of many of the clichés in his *Dictionary* and seems to have missed the probable sources of a number of others. I have noted the following (P = Partridge, B = Benham, S = Stevenson):³

P. 18, (*as man to man*) P. gives as date "late c. 19-20." But cf. Burns: "That man to man the world o'er/ shall brithers be for a' that."

P. 19, (*as ye sow, so also shall ye reap*) P.'s allusion to a phrase of Cicero and to "By their fruits ye shall know them" (*Matthew* 7, 16) ignores *Galatians* 6, 7 which is very much closer.

P. 25, (*believe it or not*) P. mentions a theatrical entertainment of this title in England, 1939-40. George Ripley's syndicated feature under this title in many American newspapers is much older.

P. 26, (*belted earl*) P. dates this "mid c. 19-20." But cf. Burns' "belted knight" in "A Man's a Man for A' That."

¹ Partridge, *A Dictionary of Clichés* (London, 1940; second edition, revised, 1941).

² Benham, *A Book of Quotations* (revised edition, London, 1936).

³ Stevenson, *The Home Book of Quotations* (New York, 1937).

P 30, *blow hot and cold* P mentions a passage in Plautus B(884a) compares "soon hot, soon cold" Much more probably Biblical (*Revelation* 3, 15 16)

P 32, *bounden duty* from the "Communion Service" of the English Book of Common Prayer

P 33, *brave and fair* P refers this to "the quotation cliché 'fair women and brave men'" But Dryden's "None but the brave deserve the fair" from "Alexander's Feast" was well known before this

P 34, *broken reed* perhaps *Isaiah* 42, 3, *Matthew* 12, 20, *Ezek* 29, 6, 7

P 37, *go about one's business* perhaps *Luke* 2, 49

P 73, *experto crede* P says "from the *experto crede* of Antonius de Avena and Robert Burton" (B574a), but the original is more likely Vergil's *experto credite* (*Aeneid* XI, 283) which is referred to in B

P 82, *fons et origo* P and B refer this to the "proverbial *fons et origo mali*" Cf *Florus* I, 41, sentence 12 *fons et origo*

P. 92, *God and Mammon* *Matthew* 6, 24, *Luke* 16, 13

P 111, *I would not touch it with a barge-pole* Cf the American "I would not touch it with a ten-foot pole"

P 141, *man and a brother* P says "Perhaps cf Campbell's 'Ye are brothers' 'Ye are men' in 'The Battle of the Baltic,' 1801" But also cf Burns, see above on (as) *man to man*

P 154, *noise abroad* *Luke* 1, 65, *Acts* 2, 6

P 160, *on his own head be it* Cf *I Kings* 2, 37; 2, 44; *Joshua* 2, 19; *Joel* 3, 4, 3, 7, *Ezekiel* 33, 4, *Psalms* 7, 16, *Acts* 18, 6

P 168, *peace in our time* from "Morning Prayer" in the Book of Common Prayer

P 175, *principalities and powers* P says "from *Titus* 3, 1" But *Ephesians* 3, 10, 6, 12 and *Romans* 8, 38 are better known

P 177, *pursuit of happiness* Jefferson in the *Declaration of Independence*, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"

P 180, *quem deus vult perdere, prius dementat* S gives the source as "a fragment of Euripides" but notes that it is preserved in Plutarch as a fragment of Aeschylus He compares Lycurgus, *In Leocratem* 21, 92 and Publius Syrus, *Sententiae*, 479 and Sophocles, *Antigone*, 621 (S1231, 25).

P 202, *sin against the light* Cf "rebel against the light" (*Job* 24, 13)

P. 204, *smell of the lamp* S refers to Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, 8 Latin, *lucernam olet* See S, s v "lamp" (1923, 14)

P 213, *steal someone's thunder* P and B refer to John Dennis and an anecdote of the London stage; but originally Latin and referred to "stealing Jove's thunder", cf *Manilius* I, 103 "solvitque animis miracula rerum; / Eripuntque Jovi fulmen, viresque tonanti." ("He hath seized from thundering Jove his thunderbolt and strength"). See B, 471b

P. 214, *stink in the nostrils of* Biblical, cf *Amos* 4, 10

P. 242, *utter darkness*. cf. "outer darkness," *Matthew* 8, 12; 22, 13; 25, 30.

P. 244, *very present help in trouble* P says "The short, the correct form

comes from *The Book of Common Prayer*" But originally from *Psalms* 46, 1

P 259, *snare and delusion* *Romans* 11, 9 is fairly close *NED* gives Denman, 1844 (incorrectly given as "1894" in S, 1081, 13)

P 259, *tender mercies* Cf *Psalms* 25, 6, 40, 11, 51, 1, 69, 16, 77, 9 etc

EDMUND G BERRY

University of Manitoba

MELVILLE'S FRIEND "TOBY"

Most of what little we know about Melville's shipmate and fellow captive in the Marquesas Islands, Richard T. Greene, is given us by the novelist himself in *Typee* and its sequel or by Professor Raymond Weaver in his pioneer biography of the author. A few bits of information dealing with "Toby's" period of residence in Sandusky, Ohio, during the middle fifties have come to my attention, and I propose in the present article to present the most interesting of these. The source of this new material is a fairly complete run of the Sandusky *Mirror* from August, 1854 to January 31, 1855, which was unearthed by Miss Naomi Lisle, of Fremont, Ohio, and which I was permitted to examine through the courtesy of Miss Dorothy Keefe, librarian of the Carnegie Library in Sandusky.

Just when Greene arrived in the Bay City is not clear, but the *Mirror* for November 6, 1854, contains a poem by him which indicates that he had lately returned to Sandusky after an extended sojourn elsewhere.¹ The next day the paper carried an announcement signed by him which stated that on that day he assumed the position of local editor, "fully sensible of our deficiency in literature and unworthiness in many respects." Thereafter he seems to have conducted a regular column in the journal—but for how long one cannot say. Presumably he left Sandusky after a period of residence of unidentified length and eventually lived in Chicago, where he died of apoplexy on August 23, 1892.²

¹ The Sandusky *Register* for Jan. 14, 1854, observes that "our friend 'Toby' has once again taken up a position as telegraph operator—in Lexington, Kentucky," and the issue for Jan. 18 carries a letter from Greene to the *Register* written in Lexington.

² Both the *Tribune* and *Herald* (Chicago) published notices of his death

One gathers the general impression from "Toby's" column that he was more of a literary fellow than one would expect an ex-sailor, ex-telegraph operator, or even a small-town editor to be. Like Jack Chase, then, Greene had undoubtedly endeared himself to Melville through his literary propensities. So far as his religious opinions are concerned, all that the partial file of the *Mirror* reveals is that he was "not a member of any religious body," although he encouraged the founding of a branch of the Y. M. C. A. in Sandusky.³

The expectation that the novice local-editor with a column to fill regularly would indulge occasionally in autobiographical reminiscence is amply gratified by the facts. For example, in the issue for January 2, 1855, he editorialized on the Galapagos Islands as a desirable acquisition to further the activities of the whaling fleet and mentioned his visit there in 1841. Again, he remarked: "Nantucket, that island of blubber, oil and spermaceti, has recently been lighted with gas, a bad example, surely, for whalers to set", and in another issue he recalled

We had a shipmate once, whom we named "Jack Nastyface," from the fact that his face was as rough as a MacAdemized [sic] road. The first time that we crossed the equator in the Pacific, "Jack" was at the mast head looking out for whales. As soon as "eight bells" were struck, and "Jack" was relieved, he was informed that we had crossed the line. "Jack" never would be behind anybody in intelligence. "The devil we did!" says "Jack." "Can't ye tell us some news? didn't I see it as well as you did, and better too? wasn't I aloft? I saw the line before any man aboard!"⁴

It is clear, too, that "Toby" lectured in Sandusky and elsewhere on his adventures in the South Seas, but thus far no full report of his lecture has been discovered.⁵

in their issues for August 25. He was apparently survived by his wife, Mary J. Greene, and a son Herman M.

³ Issue for Jan. 18, 1855.

⁴ Jan. 13, 1855. The sentence dealing with Nantucket appears in the number for Dec. 22, 1854.

⁵ The Sandusky *Register*, in its issue for Feb. 12, 1855, announced his lecture topic as "Typee; or Life in the South Pacific." On Feb. 16, 1855, he lectured at Fremont, on Feb. 17 at Toledo. The *Register* for March 9, 1855, carried the following

"Toby" is now gone East on a lecturing tour. He gave the people

It is apparent that Greene was very proud of his association with Melville, for he spoke of himself as "Toby of Typee,"⁶ and in his column for December 7, 1854, he referred to Melville. The entire passage is here reprinted

The following, which we clip from the *Ohio State Journal*, calls to mind scenes long past, and almost forgotten. We were Herman Melville's companion in his adventure on the Marquesas, and well do we remember the effect, the magnificent scenery of Nukahiva had upon our young mind.

If Melville in his "Typee" romanced, he is to be pardoned, for when we entered that bay, and saw its almost unearthly beauties break, as if by magic, on our bewildered eyes—the smooth surface of that lovely sheet of water, undisturbed save by some tiny canoe, as it shot forth from a fairy cavern, half concealed by the luxuriant foliage which hung in graceful festoons from the rocks above, we too were seized with the romantic.⁷

In "Toby's" column for December 25, 1854, there appears a letter which may also have a Melville connection. Toby writes

The following letter, which we received from an old friend in New York, will call to mind a whimsical production of ours, which was published in the *Mirror* some time since. We often see our lucubrations in sheets of greater pretensions than our own, and not always accompanied with the usual credit.

New York, Dec. 20.

Dear Toby—Have you seen *Graham* for January, yet? Of course you have; and I presume you have already graced your columns with the usual "splendid number"—"finest yet"—and all those other stereotyped phrases which lie in galleys ready for use on such occasions. But, perhaps, you are ready to inquire—what of all this? Why not ask if I have seen Godey, or Peterson, or Putnam, or any of the others? Well, I will tell you why. About the 1st of this present month I read in the *Sandusky*

of Elyria his "Typee" on Tuesday evening. The *Lorain Argus* thus speaks of it:

The lecture, last evening, by R. T. Greene, Esq., was one of deep and thrilling interest. Mr. Greene is an easy speaker, and has evidently traveled to some purpose—his lecture evinces that he has improved the opportunities for observation, which his travels have placed in his way. We regret that he was not favored with a larger audience, as we are confident that an opportunity to listen to a more interesting lecture is rarely enjoyed by our citizens.

⁶ *Mirror* for Dec. 19, 1854.

⁷ There follow two paragraphs from a letter by an officer of the British Pacific squadron (quoted from the *Ohio State Journal*, Dec. 2, 1854) describing Nukahiva Bay and concluding: "Melville's [*sic*] *Typee* gives a most interesting account of these Islands, although rather romanced."

Morning Mirror, of which you are one of the responsible editors, an article from your pen, entitled "Jeremiah's Dream, or the Effects of a Thanksgiving Dinner—being a warning to gormands"; and now almost at the close of the month, I find in *Graham* for January, "Mrs Boodle's Christmas Supper, and what came of it—or, the Dream of White Kidde", written by Von somebody and illustrated by somebody else. Now, put the two articles side by side, and anybody with half an eye, and the smallest quantum of common sense, will be at no loss to determine where Vonkomm caught his theme, or Wunovem the ideas for his illustrations. They are Jeremiah's Dream with all its phantasies, [a long passage of quotation follows]

From these parallels, who can doubt the source from whence Von Wynnkomm drew his inspiration. When in his preface he tells us of the song that Lockhart sang, of the trials of Midshipman Easy—of the tale of Geneva by Rogers—and the other celebrities of the literati, why has he not the manliness to tell that the dream of the "elegant Eglantine Arthur White Kydde" had been all dreamed ready to his hand, a month before, by Jeremiah the Meek? Come, come, Mr Kidde, when you sing

"My brain was on fire, and I leaped on the floor,

The old hall clock struck, and my Night Mare was o'er!"

you must have been thinking of the finale to Jeremiah's Dream—of whom it is said.

"A terrible blow with a maul on the head,

Knocked Jeremiah clean out of bed

In attempting to solve the horrid scheme,

He awoke, and behold! 'twas all a dream."

YOUR OLD SHIPMATE *

No one can say definitely that Melville wrote the letter above, but it is possible that he did so.⁹

CLARENCE GOHDES

Duke University

* No copy of the *Mirror* containing Greene's poem has been discovered. The contribution to *Graham's Magazine* appears in the number for Jan., 1855 (XLVI, 105-109), "'Mrs Boodle's Christmas Supper and What Came of It or the Dream of White Kidde,' written by Walter Von Wynnkomm, illustrated by William Wunovem."

The reference to Lockhart is to *The Song of the Old* in *Graham's* (p 105) the "Geneva" is explained by the lines.

"Old Rogers has sung of that famous oak lid,

'Neath which poor Geneva so snugly was hid"

⁹ I am grateful for information concerning various matters connected with my study of "Toby" to Professor Raymond Weaver, Professor Charles R. Anderson, Mr. John Birss, and the late Robert S. Forsythe

THE PUBLICATION OF MELVILLE'S *PIAZZA TALES*

From the incomplete correspondence between Herman Melville and the New York publishing firm Dix & Edwards, a portion of the bibliographical history of Melville's *Piazza Tales* (1856) may now be reconstructed. Negotiations for the appearance of the volume were evidently well under way at the time the following letter, hitherto unpublished, was written.

Pittsfield Feb 16 1856

Gentlemen —

The new title selected for the proposed volume is "*The Piazza Tales*" and the accompanying piece ("*The Piazza*") as giving that name to the book, is intended to come first in order I think, with you, that "*Bartleby*" had best come next. So that, as amended, the order will be

The Piazza
Bartleby
Benito Cereno
Lightning-Rod Man
Encantadas
Bell Tower

In the corrected magazine sheets I sent you, a M S note is appended to the title of 'Benito Cereno', but as the book is now to be published as a collection of '*Tales*', that note is unsuitable & had better be omitted.

I should like to have a proof sent to me of '*The Piazza*'. Please send by mail. The blank agreements I have not received.

It was understood that the copyright was to stand in my name. You can take it out, & charge the cost to me.

With much respect

Truly Yours

H Melville

Dix & Edwards

Publishers

N Y.¹

As indicated by the letter, Melville had already supplied Dix & Edwards with copy for five of the six sketches in the volume. This was in the form of corrected sheets from *Putnam's Monthly Magazine*, in which the sketches had appeared between November, 1853, and December, 1855. The new title-piece, however, was written especially for the volume, probably just before the above letter was composed; the manuscript note to which he refers suggests

¹ *Italics Melville's.* This letter is now in the Yale Collection of American Literature, Yale University.

that he had at first intended reprinting the magazine sketches as "*Benito Cereno and Other Pieces*," or with some similar title.

The proof and the publishing agreement which Melville requested were forwarded in due course. The agreement, signed on March 17,² provided that the author should furnish copy by February 20, as he had already done, and that he should receive a royalty of twelve and one-half per cent per copy after expenses of the volume were paid. Melville returned the contract on March 24.³

No date for publication had been set in the agreement, but advertisements subsequently printed by Dix & Edwards announced the volume as "in press" by April 5,⁴ and later as scheduled to appear on May 15.⁵ It was May 20, however, before a copy was deposited for copyright, registered, as Melville had requested, in the name of the author.⁶ The book was apparently not released to the public until the week of May 24-31.⁷

* A copy of the agreement, signed by Melville and by Dix & Edwards, with Walter Low and Mrs Melville as witnesses, is now in the Melville Collection of the Harvard University Library (Material in this collection cited here is used with permission of the Committee on Higher Degrees in the History of American Civilization, Harvard University). The date March 17 appears in the body of the agreement, but a notation on the reverse side reads March 7. The latter date is mentioned by Victor Wolfgang Von Hagen in his edition of *The Encantadas* (Burlingame, Cal., 1940), p. 115; this may have been the day on which the agreement was forwarded to Melville from New York.

* See Melville's accompanying note, printed in *Family Correspondence of Herman Melville, 1830-1904*, in the *Gansevoort-Lansing Collection*, ed. V. H. Paltsits (New York Public Library, 1929), p. 12.

* *Criterion*, I, No. 23, 353 (April 5, 1856). The book was printed by Miller & Holman, printers and stereotypers, New York City.

* *Ibid.*, II, No. 27, 16 (May 3, 1856). In the same issue, p. 8, the author of the column "Literary Intelligence," having misread the advertisement of Dix & Edwards, listed three other works then in preparation as Melville's "*Correspondence, Oriental Acquaintance, and Letters from Asia Minor*". The advertisement itself, however, presumably refers to a then forthcoming work by J. W. De Forest, *Oriental Acquaintance; or, Letters from Syria* (1856), published by Dix & Edwards, and not to projected works by Melville. See the late Robert S. Forsythe's review of Melville's *Journal up the Straits*, ed. Raymond Weaver (New York, 1935), in *American Literature*, VIII, 87 (March, 1936).

* I am indebted to Mr. Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., Curator of the Rare Book Collection of the Library of Congress, for supplying this information from records of the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New York.

* See "List of Announcements of Forthcoming Works," *American Pub-*

A report on the sale of the book up to August 28, 1856, rendered at Melville's request by Dix & Edwards, reveals that the book had not then returned the expenses of publication, which amounted to \$1,048.62. Of 2,500 copies bound, 1,193 remained on hand, 260 had been given free to editors, and 1,047 had been sold at sixty cents apiece, realizing \$628 20. The following letters, previously unpublished, accompanied the statement

New York August 30th 1856

Herman Melville Esqr

Dear Sir —

In reply to your favor of 25th inst we beg to enclose a statement of sales of Piazza Tales to this date, by which you will see that it has not yet paid expenses

We published late in May, and business has been dull since that time, but is reviving with the opening of fall trade, and we feel the good influence upon sales of all our books

The statement of Cost does not include any advertising or incidental expenses—We hope our next statement will show a handsome return

Yours respectfully

Dix, Edwards & Co *

The "next statement" promised Melville seems not to have survived, but the fact that the same house published his next work, *The Confidence-Man*, indicates that he was not dissatisfied with the handling of *The Piazza Tales*.⁹

The above records are interesting as a revelation of Melville's manner of dealing with his publishers, and of value in suggesting a date early in February, 1856, for the composition of the symbolic sketch entitled "The Piazza." The fact that Melville undertook

Wishers' Circular, II, No 21, 306 (May 24, 1856), and "Review of the Week," *Ibid*, II, No. 22, 318 (May 31, 1856) *Criterion*, II, No 31 (May 31, 1856), lists the book among "New Publications" (p 78) and gives it a brief favorable notice (p 74) Willard Thorp, *Herman Melville. Representative Selections* (New York, 1938), cites three later reviews (pp cxxv, cxlv); R. S. Forsythe, reviewing Thorp in *American Literature*, XI, 93 f (March, 1939), declared that there were more than a dozen

* The letter and statement are now in the Melville Collection of the Harvard University Library.

⁹ The agreement covering *The Confidence-Man*, signed in Melville's behalf by his brother Allan on October 28, 1856, is now in the Melville Collection of the Harvard University Library.

to reprint a series of magazine pieces in book form perhaps emphasizes his financial difficulties during this period of his life for which so few biographical facts are known.

MERTON M. SEALTS

U S. Army Corps

THE MEANING OF POE'S "ELDORADO"

As usually interpreted, Poe's "Eldorado" (1849) is a poem with an idealistic message, the substance of which is contained in the final stanza:

"Over the Mountains
Of the Moon,
Down the Valley of the Shadow,
Ride, boldly ride,"
The shade replied,—
"If you seek for Eldorado!"

Thirty years ago C. Alphonso Smith stated his belief that this stanza expressed "the unconquerable idealism of the poet and the idealism of the nation whose fame he carried into all lands."¹ Various subsequent commentators have echoed Professor Smith's exegesis. For example, Killis Campbell considers the poem to be "finely emblematic of Poe's own faith and aspirations",² Margaret Alterton and Hardin Craig say "Poe writes of the search for the golden land as the quest of human happiness in which man never tires. 'Eldorado' is . . . a noble expression of the ideal as Poe sought it, and as all men, to some extent at least, also seek it";³ and Harry Hayden Clark describes the poem as "representing Poe's ideality."⁴

Finding it difficult to envisage the author of "The Conqueror Worm" joining hands with the author of "Childe Roland to the

¹ C. Alphonso Smith, "Our Heritage of Idealism," *Sewanee Review*, xx, 248-249 (April, 1912).

² Killis Campbell, *The Poems of Edgar Allan Poe* (Boston, 1917), 286.

³ Margaret Alterton and Hardin Craig, *Edgar Allan Poe* (New York, 1935), 507.

⁴ Harry Hayden Clark, *Major American Poets* (New York, 1936), 844. Other well known studies of Poe, such as those by G. E. Woodberry, Mary E. Phillips, Hervey Allen, Una Pope-Hennessy, Edward Shanks, and A. H. Quinn, make little or no attempt at interpretation of the poem.

Dark Tower Came," I should like to offer an interpretation that seems to me more characteristic of Poe than those summarized above. The poem was written in the last year of the poet's life, during which he had moments of realization that the end was not far off and that it would be welcome when it came,⁵ and in this mood, I believe, he used the mythical Eldorado, suggested by the gold rush of 1849, to symbolize death, the land of gold for him. The route to this realm lies "over the mountains of the moon" and "down the valley of the shadow." The latter phrase is, of course, one of the most familiar symbols of the approach to death, and is so used by Poe in his prose tale, "Shadow: A Parable." While the reference to the moon is a less evident emblem, it should be pointed out that in other poems, e.g., "Dreams" and "Evening Star," he represents the moon as cold and unearthly, and in "Tamerlane" (ll. 201-206) her beams "will seem . . . a portrait taken after death." Hence one is warranted in viewing the road which the knight is enjoined to traverse, not as a series of obstacles that must be faced if one seeks to attain the goal of the ideal, rather it is the pathway that ushers one into the Eldorado of death. The guide who directs the knight to this route is a "pilgrim shadow" or "shade," presumably a spirit returned from the other world (or possibly, as in "Shadow," a composite of all departed spirits), who has learned by experience that Eldorado is to be found not in life but in death.

Poe's only other allusion to Eldorado, in verse at least, occurs in "Dream-Land" (1844), which land he describes in part in these lines:

For the heart whose woes are legion
 'T is a peaceful, soothing region—
 For the spirit that walks in shadow
 'T is—oh, 't is an Eldorado!

The parallel is somewhat close, for again a realm that makes possible an escape from "the fever called 'Living'" is a land of gold. That such a philosophy of life, for poetic purposes at any rate, had seized the poet's mind at the outset of his literary career is evident from "The Lake" (1827), which ends with the following stanza.

Death was in that poisonous wave,
 And in its gulf a fitting grave

⁵ Arthur Hobson Quinn, *Edgar Allan Poe* (New York, 1941), 618.

For him who thence could solace bring
 To his lone imagining,
 Whose solitary soul could make
 An Eden of that dum lake

Poe's thanatopsis, first and last, would seem to have been essentially consistent in his youth the domain of death was an Eden, and in the last year of his life it was Eldorado

ORAL SUMNER COAD

New Jersey College for Women

REVIEWS

Norwegian Word Studies By EINAR HAUGEN. Vol. 1. The Vocabularies of Sigrid Undset and Ivar Aasen (pp. 30, xvii, 189, xxi, 157, xii, 78), Vol. 2 The Vocabularies of the Old Norse Sagas and of Henrik Wergeland (pp. xvi, 166, xvii, 338). Distributed by The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin, 1942.

These are two thick typewritten (mimeographed) volumes, each of which is divided into several sections with different pagination (sometimes lacking). The first volume is headed by a General Introduction (pp. 30) in which the history, the description, and the uses of word counts are surveyed. In this part I miss a reference to any of the several concordances or *ordskatter* that have been published in Scandinavia, especially Sweden and Finland, headed by L. Larsson's excellent book *Ordforrådet i de äldsta islandska handskrifterna* (Lund, 1891).¹ This book is a morphological-lexical compilation of all words (in all their occurrences) in the oldest Icelandic manuscripts, so arranged, that one can count all the occurrences of any word, either in any of the works separately, or in them all together. Haugen singles out Heffner-Lehmann's index to the poems of Walther von der Vogelweide (Madison, 1940) as "the most meticulous analysis available," but from the description it appears that these scholars have followed exactly the method adopted long ago by the Swedish-Finnish scholars.

It is true, of course, that Haugen's word lists are not so much

¹ Others: H. Pipping, *Äldre Västgötalagens ordskatt*, Helsingfors, 1913, and A. Nordling, *Ordskatten i Södermannalagens textöde*, Helsingfors, 1928.

related to these old grammatical concordances as to the more modern frequency dictionaries and word lists for pedagogical purposes,—of which he gives a list for the modern Scandinavian tongues. Haugen's interest in these lists began, he tells us, when he was making a textbook of elementary Norwegian, but the present work was made possible through the employment of some 3-35 WPA workers. As these were of very different quality, some errors could not be avoided, but Haugen has considered them too insignificant to be weeded out at the cost of a great deal of money and work. I am inclined to agree with him on this point, though it can not be denied that the work is somewhat disfigured by these errors.

The exact titles of the following parts is as follows

- Part II Sigrid Undset's Novels of Medieval Life,
- Part III Sigrid Undset's Early Stories of Modern Life,
- Part IV Ivar Aasen's Writings in New Norse

In the second volume.

- Part I Snorri Sturluson's *Heimskringla*, *Egils saga*, and *Njáls saga*,
- Part II The Belles Lettres of Henrik Wergeland

Each of these parts is preceded by an introduction in two parts, the first being a concise orientation of the literary position of the work, the second dealing with more specific problems of style as reflected in the language of the writer. In general this linguistic scrutiny of the modern authors tends to fix their place in the changing tradition of Modern Norwegian with its two linguistic polarities: the Danish (to some extent native East Norwegian), and the native New Norse, rooted in the rural dialects, especially of the West, most nearly related to the Old Norwegian and to Old Icelandic.

The choice of the texts reflects Haugen's desire to cut straight through to this central problem in the development of the Norwegian language. Wergeland, the early 19th century romantic poet, still stands in the flourishing Dano-Norwegian period, with stress on conformity to Danish orthography and forms, if not pronunciation. Undset stands in the stream of that same tradition, later by a century, but influenced in two ways by the *landsmåal*-movement, though she does not share it, and by the Icelandic sagas. The latter influence is made neatly clear by Haugen's comparison of her language on two levels: the early modern, and the later medieval stories.

While Wergeland and Undset represent the *riksmaal*, Aasen represents the *landsmåal* which he created, so to speak, single-handed out of the material of the rural dialects with the Old Norse as a corrective norm.

Finally, for the sake of comparison, Haugen gives the word-hoard of three major Icelandic sagas: *Heimskringla*, *Egils saga* and *Njála*. As usual Haugen's selection of texts is happy, and

that not only for linguistic purposes. For by giving the vocabulary of these three texts he has laid ideal foundations for further study into the vexed question of *Egils saga's* authorship, a question that had already been put on a firm basis by Wieselgren's dissertation (*Egla*, 1927) and materially furthered by Nordal's edition (*Islensk fornrit* II, 1933). Wieselgren tried to disprove Snorri's authorship of *Egla* by showing the differences in usage, but Nordal demonstrated that Wieselgren did not sufficiently take into account the changes wrought by later scribes, notably the scribe of *Modruvallabók*, who is shown to have abbreviated his text. Though this source of error remains, there seems to be hope that one could show by the use of Haugen's wordlists a significant similarity between *Heimskringla* and *Egla* as against *Njála*, which undoubtedly is by a different author.

Here I shall add a few remarks as to Haugen's method and how the work has been done. His list is a typographical one, lumping different words in one count if they are formally alike. Thus we find the form *er* occurring 5957 times in *Hkr* (Haugen's a, b, c), 1688 times in *Egla* (Haugen's e), and 1881 times in *Njála* (Haugen's n). But no distinction is made between *er*, (he, she, it) is, *er* relative pronoun and *er* temporal conjunction. Of words occurring five times or less all occurrences are given with references to page and line (*Hkr.*), chapter and paragraph (*Njála*), or page and centimeter from the top (*Egla*).

For words occurring 6-200 times one reference is given to their first occurrence, but the number of occurrences in each work (*Hkr.*, *Egla*, *Njála*) is given in parenthesis after the word, e. g. *fylkingu* (7-1-0) a 204. 3, i. e. it occurs seven times in *Hkr.* (first occurrence in vol I, p. 204 3) once in *Egla*, never in *Njála*. For words occurring more than 200 times no reference is given, but the number of occurrences is stated.

Haugen warns the users of his lists that he has not been able to eliminate errors, especially typographical, though he has printed some errata at the end of each of his parts. Glancing over the Norwegian lists, I have been unable to spot any errors. More is naturally found in the Old Norse parts, the language being foreign to the author, and involving extensive use of accents unfamiliar to the typists. When these accents are found on top of consonants they are easily disregarded as printer's errors, since no consonants are so marked in Icelandic. The mistakes are worse in the vowels, yet, they are not too serious, since accented and unaccented vowels are arranged together in the alphabet. An occasional *d* for the Icelandic *ð* is not serious for the same reason. It is much worse when a *p* is substituted for *þ*, since *þ* is listed after *z* in the alphabet. Thus we find *íprótt*, *ípróttir* and *íþrótt*, *íþróttir* in different places, the first two are given as occurring once in *Hkr.*, while the latter occur (6-1-1) and (7-1-1) times respectively. The corrected numbers will thus be (7-1-1) and (8-1-1).

In the letter *a(á)* (7½ pp.) I have found 26 printer's errors (only one listed in the errata). Of these ten involve a wrongly put or omitted accent mark ('), in most of the cases this is plain from the preceding or following words, e g *Astu* for *Ástu*. But it is not so plain that *ámbl* should be *ambí*. In other cases there has been a substitution of letters *ájúlfr* for *sjúlfr*, *áleidis* for *áleiðis*, *apýrja* for *spýrja*, *apýrr* for *spýrr*, *ar* for *at*, *angevinn* for *átgevinn*, *avá* for *svá*, *Áþarðjónar* for *Apardjónar*, *aptr* for *aptr*. Finally there are omissions or interchange of letters *allfölmennr* for *allfjölmennt*, *Álpat-* for *Álpta-*, *Auðjarnar* for *Auðbjarnar*, *austanverðr* for *austanverðr*, *ápýðu* for *alþýðu*. In one case, I suspect a printer's error in F. Jónsson's edition of *Hkr* (vol II, p 150 ? *almúkt* for *allmúkt*), but if it is one F. Jónsson repeated it in his 1911 edition (p 245 5).

It is obvious from this that the users of the index must be on their guard against errors, and Haugen himself so warns the reader. On the other hand, I found no wrong reference, so that the error, once spotted, was easily corrected by reference to the texts. I think therefore that the lists will be found to be useful tools in spite of their shortcomings.

The compiler deserves warm thanks for his energy in completing this by no means easy job.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

Walt Whitman · Poet of Democracy By HUGH L'ANSON FAUSSET.
New Haven · Yale University Press, 1942. Pp 320. \$3.00.

Among the multiplicity of books treating Whitman, it is a pleasant surprise to find one that sounds a new valid note. Fausset's study does this neatly, deftly, if not always infallibly. The author is competent to examine in detail the nature of the poetic process, as he has already done admirably with the English Romantic poets and others. He illuminates the tortured ways of Whitman's erratic method of composition. But on the whole, the present volume cannot boast the quintessential definitiveness that has characterised this Englishman's previous analyses of English minds. Fausset is not at home in America.

A thoughtful reading of this primarily critical biography quickens one's perceptions of problems in today's world. But, in his zeal to interpret Whitman for modern readers, Fausset sometimes lugs in comments that seem frank bids to make the book fit the contemporary audience. This "dates" it definitely and it may prove less lasting in its appeal for that reason. A more objective approach, letting facts speak for themselves with a minimum of personal comment or interpretation, would probably have produced a more lasting contribution to Whitman scholarship. Yet no stu-

dent or reader of Whitman can afford to miss this well directed effort to meet the long-felt need for a semi-scholarly, readable handbook of Whitman's life and works. Further, the present volume includes some material not utilized in the excellent earlier biographies by Bliss Perry and Emory Holloway.

Usually cautious, the author does take one long chance in stipulating definitely that Whitman was homosexual, or possessed an "unusually bi-sexual nature." So far as known, there is no proof except inferences from what might be considered strong internal evidence. Fausset adroitly presses this method of induction to its maximum limits, proceeding entirely upon the basis of psychological probability.

The primary motivation of this review is to evaluate Fausset's work as a permanent contribution to essential knowledge of Whitman. It is surprising to find this brilliant and experienced writer, meticulous in most respects, allowing frequent slight inaccuracies to give a slipshod effect not in keeping with the general scholarly tone. In addition to inaccurate quotations, there are numerous errors or mistaken assumptions, such as the following, which should be corrected for serious students or researchers.

- P 299 "Mark Conway" should read "Moncure D. Conway,"
- P 312 (Index) Mark Conway and Moncure D. Conway are listed as separate individuals, but are really the same.
- P 63 "No copy of it [*The Freeman*] has survived." See illustration of a copy in the catalogue of the American Art Association, Anderson Galleries, Inc., New York, Sale No 4252, April 15-16, 1936.
- P 100 "The first edition of *Leaves of Grass* was advertised for sale in the *New York Tribune* for July 6th, 1855." Conclusive arguments in favor of the Fourth of July as the first day of issue are advanced by Ralph Adimari in *The American Book Collector*, vol v, pp 150-152. It should also be noted that the *New York Times* carried announcements that Fowler and Wells, who handled the book, would be open July 4, 1855.
- P 11 "The Whitmans were buried under unlettered stones." Whitman himself, describing the family burial ground, speaks only of "crumbled and broken stones, covered with moss" (see "The Old Whitman and Van Velsor Cemeteries" in *Specimen Days*). Joseph Pennell, in his drawing of the spot made in 1881, clearly indicates letters on the stones (see R. M. Bucke, *Walt Whitman*, Philadelphia, 1883, p. 17).
- P 22 "Before 1836 was over he had left New York and did not return to it for nearly five years." Whitman notebooks in the Library of Congress contain these statements: "I went up to Hempstead from New York 1st of May 1836," and later, "Came down to New York (after selling Nina) in the summer of '39" (Emory Holloway, *Uncollected Poetry and Prose of Walt Whitman*, II, 86, 87).
- P 17 "An inner division, extreme enough in two of his brothers to cause actual insanity, created in him only difficult moods." This statement, important because of its bearing on Fausset's fundamental psychological thesis that Whitman had a split personality, has been refuted authoritatively by Frances Win-

- war in "The Dual Personality of Walt Whitman," *New York Times Book Review*, June 14, 1942, p 5
- P 138 "It [Whitman's famous walk with Emerson on Boston Common in 1860] happened on a bright keen February day" But Whitman did not go to Boston until March 15 of that year, and wrote to Abby M Price about his visit with Emerson, saying that it occurred immediately after the middle of March See C J Furness, "Walt Whitman Looks at Boston," *New England Quarterly*, I, 358-359
- P 198 "Whitman only recognized Lincoln's true worth fully at his death Later, indeed, he described the days following the disastrous battle of Bull Run in July, 1861, as those in which he had first realized Lincoln's unconquerable qualities But, in fact, it seems probable that he still shared to some extent the average American's distrust of the President after that date" But Whitman wrote to his mother, October 11, 1863, "I believe fully in Lincoln" (*The Wound-Dresser*, p 129), and on October 15, 1863 he wrote to Abby Price, "I believe fully in Lincoln—few know the rocks and quicksands he has to steer through and over" (R M Bucke, *Walt Whitman*, p 40) Again to his mother, October 27, 1863 "I have finally made up my mind that Mr Lincoln has done as good as a human man could do I still think him a pretty big President" (*The Wound-Dresser*, p 139) In a MS diary in the Library of Congress, Whitman wrote under date of October 31, 1863 "Called at the President's house on John Hay Saw Mr Lincoln standing, talking with a gentleman, apparently a dear friend His face and manner have an expression inexpressibly sweet—one hand on his friend's shoulder, the other holding his hand I love the President personally" Other corrections have been suggested in C J Furness, "He Heard America Singing," *Saturday Review of Literature*, July 18, 1942, pp 6 7 Also in *New England Quarterly*, September, 1942, pp 557-560

Moreover, sources are seldom cited, so that the usefulness of the book as a standard reference work is limited

In spite of deficiencies from the standpoint of pure scholarship, however, Fausset is to be congratulated for providing what is distressingly rare in these days a balanced mental ration We see Whitman the man and Whitman the poet "in the round." The author clearly delineates Whitman's limitations, which are sufficiently obvious, though their psychological and esthetic explanation has not always been handled so clearly or so cleverly by other analysts. At the same time we are given a grateful picture of the genius that would admit no compromise with the consecrated goal to "make the works" It would be hard to produce a more moving re-vivification of the spirit of Walt Whitman for the contemporary lay-reader than that offered by Mr. Fausset.

CLIFTON JOSEPH FURNESS

New England Conservatory

Thraliana. The Diary of Mrs Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs Piozzi) 1776-1809 Edited by KATHARINE C BALDERSTON. Oxford The Clarendon Press [New York Oxford University Press], 1942. 2 vols, pp xxxvi + 1192. \$15 00.

In the course of filling six volumes of manuscript with a personal record which is something between a journal and a commonplace book Hester Thrale repeatedly speculated upon the probable destiny of her "farrago," seeming to hesitate between the hope and the fear of its ultimate publication. It is certain that she never foresaw anything like its appearance in two handsome volumes from the distinguished press of Johnson's university, edited by a scholar of her own sex with a devotion suitable to a work of serious literature, and provided with an index (a good one) of ninety-one pages. One would like to have her own mock review of *Thraliana* in the vein of those which she wrote for her own *Letters to and from Dr. Johnson* and *Retrospection*. It might serve to keep an earnest modern reviewer from being too earnest, even on subjects Johnsonian.

The general character of *Thraliana* has long been well known, and its contents have been intensively, if not extensively, quarried, by the author herself for her *Anecdotes*, by Hayward for his *Autobiography, Letters, and Literary Remains of Mrs Piozzi (Thrale)*, and by Hughes for *Mrs Piozzi's Thraliana*. Although the previously published excerpts amount to less than a fourteenth of the original, they have been cunningly chosen, and the Johnsonian reader, at least, who picks up these volumes rejoicing in the promise of their weight is bound to feel some disappointment that they do not yield him more that is new. The avowed Thralian, however, or the confirmed relisher of diaries will have no cause for complaint. The book will keep him for thirty-three years in the intimate company of a woman who made an art of being good company for two husbands, for their friends and her own, and, what a Johnson could never achieve, for herself.

Thraliana has the advantage over most regular diaries that the entries are seldom the result of mere habit or sense of duty and the advantage over most commonplace books that the anecdotes, jests, verses, and what not are usually set in a context of personal feeling and first-hand experience. The defects of its narrative thread are of less account now that it can be read with Mr. J. L. Clifford's biography at the elbow, and that is how it should be read. Boswell's *Life* at the other elbow is taken for granted.

The limitations of Mrs. Thrale's learning and literary judgment are here fully displayed. Some of the puns and witticisms which she thought worth recording are sad stuff indeed, and the occasional and other verses from her own and her acquaintances' pens, if segregated into an anthology, would make a volume appropriate

for shelving with the *Florence Miscellany*. Her continual ventures into etymological conjecture are at first amusing and then wearisome in their amateurishness. Her zeal in finding literary "sources" is often on the same uncritical level. There is only too much evidence of her inaccuracy in small details. Her errant style with its armory of dashes and ampersands will vex the orderly in almost every entry of any length. In short, she is consistently "unscholarly," to apply a word of great usefulness in damning a lively mind. Yet there are still not a few shrewd comments on current literature, as when she calls *The Mysteries of Udolpho* as like *Macbeth* "as Pepper-Mint Water to good Brandy" or remarks in August, 1808

The fashionable Poetry of Southey and Scott will fall into Decay—
Madoe and Thalaba, Teviot Dale and Marmion depend too much on their
Colouring. In a hundred Years People will wonder why they were so
admired—

But *Thraliana* is primarily a book about people and about human nature. It is the author's way to follow a particular anecdote with a general remark on the quality of mind or character which it betrays. There is less gossip in the narrower sense than might be expected, less certainly than some readers would like, there is little matter that is recognizably spiteful and much that is clearly magnanimous. The author records the receipt of Baretti's insulting letter on her marriage with less indignation than it deserved (in the same passage she merely calls Johnson's famous letter *rough*), and concludes calmly, "but I think the man is fit for Bedlam." Nor could one ask a more sensible attitude toward the flirtation of Sophia Streatfeild and Henry Thrale. A comment (suggestive of Johnson) on Italy in 1786 would make a fair motto for much of the journal. "Nothing is either as good or as bad as one *hears* it is."

She is an analytical observer of people, as the scoring of her friends in a table of personal qualities clearly shows. She does not forget to analyze herself, and it must be allowed that she does it without mock-modesty, morbidity, or the anxious self-justification of a Boswell. In the crisis following her renunciation of Piozzi there are some passages too suggestive of a sentimental novel for some tastes. That they were not mere false rhetoric the whole second volume with its record of her devotion to the man abundantly testifies. Her defense against the charge of emptiness deserves quotation.

Often have I spoken what I have repented after, but that was want of *Judgment*—not of *Meaning*, what I said, I meant to say at the Time; & thought it best to say—I do not err from Haste, or a Spirit of Rattling as People think I do: when I err, it is because I make a false Conclusion, not because I make no Conclusion at all. When I rattle, I rattle *on purpose*.
(17 Jan. 1789)

Miss Balderston has annotated the text sensibly and adequately, without over-editing. The Introduction is brief and well balanced, with a remarkable "character" of Mrs Thrale in a single sentence on p x. Some of the notes are skillful summaries of previous research or controversy. The long note on pp 810-11 well presents the case against Boswell's treatment of the lady, but slips in denying the survival of Boswell's journal for the spring of 1778, which exists, though unavailable, among the Fettercairn Papers. The typography is of the expected excellence, but clearer differentiation of the editor's footnotes from the marginal notes of Mrs Thrale would have been a convenience.

RICHARD L. GREENE

The University of Rochester

The Correspondence of Richard Steele Edited by RAE BLANCHARD
New York Oxford University Press, 1941. Pp xxviii + 562.
\$10 00.

Professor Blanchard's task of collecting and editing the correspondence of Steele was far more difficult and exacting than is realized by most readers, and she can be warmly congratulated on the results. Her work is the basis for all future scholarship in the immediate field: she has produced the first satisfactory text of all Steele's letters and those addressed to him, she has gone to extremes in assaying and printing every scrap of extant material; she has annotated as fully as was possible, and has solved numerous knotty problems of chronology and arrangement. Her work does not, however, follow the orthodox pattern. Instead of presenting the reader with one chronological list of letters, she divides her items into (I) general correspondence, (II) family correspondence, and (III) miscellaneous printed letters and papers. She prints her notes immediately after the text of each letter, she includes fragments and summaries of letters from auction catalogues and other sources, and finally she includes (in ten instances) letters neither written by nor addressed to Steele, when these throw light on the Steele correspondence.

The present reviewer has found his own knowledge of the days of Addison and Steele so enriched by the investigations of Professor Blanchard that he hesitates to make certain observations which will occur to some students of this volume. Nevertheless, the division of the contents raises once more the question whether there is any wiser arrangement than the orthodox single chronological listing. It is quickly apparent that any student interested in Steele's literary or political life must read the "family correspondence" with as much thoroughness as the "general correspondence." One may point to letters 212, 226, 260, 280, 282, 333,

334, 340, 364, 371, 374, and others, for illustrations of the fact that Steele's family affairs and public life were inextricably intertwined. The three-fold division of the correspondence may have its value to the casual reader, it certainly is an inconvenience to the scholar. In the second place, the practice of printing the notes immediately after each letter, which appears at first an admirable innovation, frequently requires the reader to turn the page to find his note.

The reviewer holds no brief for the lazy scholar, and he realizes that these minor questions of method do not affect seriously the solid accomplishment of Professor Blanchard. Yet they are of some importance to future editors of correspondence, since it is almost inevitable that those who venture into this exacting field of scholarship do so without previous experience or knowledge of the problems involved. In the main, the Editor has carried through her difficult task with competence and judgment. In its own field, her book must be regarded as one of the most important publications of recent years.

WALTER GRAHAM

University of Illinois

Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions from All Souls Ms 182.

Edited by M. DOMINICA LEGGE. Published for the Anglo-Norman Text Society. Basil Blackwell · Oxford (1941). Pp. xxiii + 495.

All Souls Ms 182 is an Anglo-Norman letter-book compiled in the first half of the fifteenth century. It contains forty-one petitions and four hundred and twelve letters. The majority of the letters that can be dated were written between 1390 and 1412. While there is a wide range of addressors and addressees, the bulk of the letters fall into three groups—those written by or addressed to the sons and grandsons of Edward III, the two Arundel brothers, and Henry Despenser, bishop of Norwich and his relatives. They cover, as the examples in a letter-book should, almost every subject about which one might want to write a letter.

The work of Miss Legge as editor is highly satisfactory. She has shown a broad knowledge of the period, rare ingenuity, and incredible industry in identifying the many obscure persons mentioned in the letters. Her historical notes are accurate, brief, and to the point. A few identifications seem to rest on rather slender foundations, but the reader can easily reject these if he wishes. Real slips are rare. I cannot see how Miss Legge gets Norfolk out of North' in letter forty-two, but as the letter is addressed to the bishop of Norwich the error is understandable.

There is one question that should be brought up less as a criticism of Miss Legge than as a plea to future editors of similar letter-books. While this volume is a veritable mine of material for the specialist in almost every phase of English mediaeval history, few will be able to use it effectively. The historian who is writing the history of the period covered by the letters will obviously read the book through. The biographer can use the index of names. But what of the specialist in a branch of history—the social or the legal historian? To read four hundred and twenty letters for a few nuggets, no matter how valuable they may be, is too much labor. In short a volume of this sort that contains material on every conceivable subject is almost useless for many scholars without a subject index.

SIDNEY PAINTER

The Johns Hopkins University

BRIEF MENTION

Victorian Prelude, a History of English Manners, 1700-1830. By MAURICE J. QUINLAN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. x + 301. \$3.00. Readers of Sir Herbert Grierson's *Cross Currents in English Literature* will remember how he opens the book with a reference to an essay that appeared in 1823 by one Joseph Foster "On the Aversion of Men of Taste to Evangelical Religion." To Grierson the publication of this essay when the Romantic Movement was at its height was merely one more symptom of an age-old conflict that had been particularly acute in the seventeenth century, but Mr. Quinlan is able to show that Foster (whom, incidentally, he does not mention) was typical of an increasingly influential section of public opinion in his day, and is part of the historical phenomenon which he has set out to investigate.

Mr. Quinlan has written a pleasant and interesting book, but if he finds the present reviewer a little disposed to be critical he must attribute the fact in large measure to his sub-title. The book is *not* a "history of English manners from 1700 to 1830", it is at most a history of one section of the populace and its steadily increasing influence. It tells the story of the philanthropic societies and the Evangelical Movement, tracing their effect on manners and opinions.

Americans abroad have often felt bewildered and hurt to find their country judged solely by Prohibition, the Scopes trial, or the Saccho and Vanzetti trial. To take Mr. Quinlan's book at its face

value would be to pass a similarly distorted judgment. His England is not the England of Fielding or Jane Austin, or even of *Pendennis* and *Nicholas Nickleby*, it is a far bleaker place, obsessed by a much more rigorous way of life. The reader needs some corrective to redress the balance. It would be too extreme to recommend Byron's letters to Lady Melbourne as an antidote, it would probably suffice to set the circulation of *The Edinburgh Review* or *Blackwood's* alongside that of *The Methodist Magazine* or *The Evangelical Magazine*. Other values beside those of the Evangelicals persisted, "men of taste," for example, may eventually have been forced into a defensive position, as Matthew Arnold's career proves, but they were never completely routed.

Two minor matters the annotator referred to in the note on page 205 is almost certainly the Oxford antiquary Philip Bliss, and is therefore to be trusted. On page 246 Mr. Quinlan has done a grave injustice to the renowned Mr. Bowdler, he has either been misled into thinking that his edition of Shakespeare is the same as that which Bowdler used, or he has neglected to glance at the textual notes. Many of the excisions and inconsistencies in *I Henry IV* to which he refers were due not to Bowdler but to the editors of the First Folio, and were the result of the Jacobean regulations against profanity on the stage.

R. C. BALD

Cornell University

CORRESPONDENCE

THE RUIN AGAIN. Dr. C. W. Kennedy (*The Earliest English Poetry*, p. 115) makes this statement: "the identification of the poem with Bath has been generally accepted. How strong is the evidence which supports this theory is clearly shown by Miss Hotchner in her monograph of 1939." Miss Hotchner¹ seeks to vitiate the theory set forth by me in *MLN*, LVI (1939), 37-39, that the scene described by the author of the *Ruin* was the Roman wall and its adjuncts, rather than Bath, because she prefers to have the poem written in Wessex. (This in spite of the fact that OE poets were scarcely circumscribed in the geographical distribution of their subject-matter.) Her book abounds with errors of fact and inference as the following random examples show.

Miss Hotchner introduces her reconstruction of the text with these words: "it seems advisable, before entering upon the analysis, to present the text of *The Ruin*, in its entirety."² The damaged state of the MS. makes this utterly impossible.

¹ *Wessex And Old English Poetry, With Special Consideration of The Ruin*. By Cecelia A. Hotchner. New York, 1939.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

Miss Hotchner has not seen the Wall, Bath, or any Roman remains *in situ*. It is not requisite that she should have, but had she first-hand knowledge she would not have gained the impression that tiles are unusual, that the sooty structure of Roman heating arrangements (at the Wall, occasionally still complete with coal) is hard to identify or that Bath is ten miles above sea-level.³

Her use of printed material leads to rather unexpected results. For example, she cites (without comment or the slightest attempt at reconciliation) contradictory passages from two books in a single paragraph: "Hadrian's Wall never for a moment left unguarded" (p. 13) "Historians tell us that the mural garrison was once and again defeated and driven out of their strongholds" (p. 15).

Old English semantics has its pitfalls for our author. Let us take as an example *hringmere*, which is a kenning and an hapax legomenon. The meaning of its component elements is clear, but this does not mean that the meaning of the compound is necessarily the sum of the apparent meanings of its parts, e.g. *gar secg*, and since it appears in a very defective passage associated only with a fragmentary preceding word (probably to be read *oððæt* and a single following word (*hāte*), the precise modern English equivalent must remain at least speculative. Miss Hotchner translates it in two different ways, herself, but feels that its presence in the poem localizes the scene in Bath, saying "The rareness of circular baths, in Roman Britain is attested by the fact that only at Bath is one recorded" (p. 46). There are other baths in Roman Britain to which either of her translations might apply. Apsidal baths occur (at the Wall, for instance) and there are cases of two apsidal baths facing each other. There is a pretty good round bath at Mumrills, a photograph of which may be consulted in Sir George Macdonald's *The Roman Wall in Scotland* (1934), facing p. 72. The appearance of the word *hringmere* in the poem does not identify the site with Bath, or any of several other places, the Wall included.

"the poem tells us very plainly that a city is its subject. Note such expression as *burgstede* (2), *burgraced* (21), *burgsteall* (28), and *burg* (37, 49)." No authorities are cited for this simplification (p. 11) of the semantics of *burg*, and the best would hardly support it. Even if the meaning of the word were restricted in the way she feels it should be, it would not affect my contention that the poem refers to the Wall and near by structures. There were cities adjacent to the Wall.

"If the Saxons had found no evidence of a military station at Aquae Sulis, would they have chosen a name with the suffix -ceaster?" (p. 19) Haverfield and Macdonald answer thus: "In literary Anglo-Saxon 'chester' was used without reference to the Romans, or to any special people or persons, to denote any enclosed place, inhabited or meant for inhabita-

³ *Op cit*, pp. 51-52. "When we realize that the Great Bath is fed by boiling water gushing forth from the ground at a temperature of 116° Fahrenheit."

⁴ *The Roman Occupation of Britain* Oxford, 1924, p. 213, n.

tion" Again let us suppose that Miss Hotchner is right Does it affect the argument much? Place-names in *-chester* are very abundant along the Wall

Miss Hotchner feels that the presence of much Roman tile at Bath can be used to distinguish that site from the one I proposed Roman tile is found very widely distributed in England and there is a large quantity along the Wall The great and complicated buildings were not open to the sky There is red plaster, *in situ*, in various places There was even a military tile yard which stamped its regimental identification on its tiles⁸ Slate was also used, to be sure, but if redness of wall and roof is useful for identifying what the poet was talking about, there is plenty of red tile and plaster at the Wall, as well as at dozens of other places in Britain

"In this connection note the evidence presented by another station in Herben's list, Benwell (Condercum) In mentioning this he greatly weakens his own case, for here were found in 1766 coins and treasure which had remained buried from the time of Marcus Aurelius How, then, would the Anglo Saxon poet have seen them? Logical reasoning (*sic*) and a mere superficial knowledge of human nature prompt the question If they had been exposed in the eighth century, would greedy and curious hands have permitted them to remain untouched through ten long centuries?" (p 21) I, of course, did not say that the Anglo Saxon poet had seen them

"If Mr Herben is to convince his readers that the architectural details of the poem are appropriate to Hadrian's Wall, he will have to produce a better illustration than the bridge of Chollerford, for nowhere is a bridge mentioned" (p 32) Nothing is offered from Bath to illustrate the unusual type of construction specified in ll 19 and 20 of the poem Chollerford Bridge fulfills the requirements. Until a better alternative is presented, we may continue to suggest that the poet does mention and does describe a bridge, Chollerford Bridge

I have already stated that these are but random examples The adept will find a great many more which I have passed over

We are reduced by the nature of the problem to conjecture, in this matter. It may be that the poet had another site in mind when he composed his haunting verses, possibly (as I suggested in my original article) Bath, but the person who will demonstrate this must use other and better methods and skills than those of Miss Hotchner, for nothing that she has brought forth in any way necessitates a modification of my statement that the Wall and adjacent structures fulfill every requirement of the poem and that as one who has often visited both sites, I cannot feel otherwise than that the poet was writing about the nearer and infinitely more impressive ruin

STEPHEN J HERBEN

Bryn Mawr College

⁸ "I have been unable to find even the slightest reference to significant roof remains along the northern Border." (Miss Hotchner, *op cit.*, p. 34.) See Arch. Ael 1927, p 183, *inter alia*

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

FEBRUARY, 1944

Number 2

LATIN *-ct-* > OLD FRENCH *ʃt*

Examples of this change appear in LLat *'faktu factum*, *'nokte noctem*, *fruktu fructum*, which become OFr *faɪt* (Fr. *fait*), *nyɪt* (Fr. *nuit*), *fryɪt* (Fr. *fruit*). There are some points relating to the physiological patterns that still remain vague.

A table presenting the solutions offered by several linguists will make this clear. They are derived from the following sources, arranged in the chronological order of the latest references here quoted for each author —

(1) K Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, vol 1, Copenhagen, 1899 (2) G Grober, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*², vol 1, Strassburg, 1904-6 (3) P E Guarnerio, *Fonologia romana*², Milano, 1918 (4) W Meyer-Lubke, *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache*^{2,3}, vol 1, Heidelberg, 1913, 'Die Gruppe *ct*,' *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 1927 (5) E Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane*², Paris, 1930 (6) Schwan-Behrens, *Grammaire de l'ancien français*, part 1 (Bloch), Leipzig, 1932 (7) F Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française*, vol. 1, Paris, 1933 (8) M K Pope, *From Latin to Modern French*, Manchester, 1934 (9) A. Dauzat, *Histoire de la langue française*, Paris, 1930 (10) M Grammont, *Traité de phonétique*, Paris, 1933, review of Dauzat's *Tableau, Le français moderne*, 1939

The different stages, as premised by each of these, are here shown. The symbol *ɣ* is used for fricative *j* Roman characters here and elsewhere represent IPA transcription, based upon the opinion of competent scholars.

	kt	ct	kɪ	cɪ	xt	ɣt	çt	tɪ	t	ɣt	ɣt	tɪ	t
1. Nyrop	kt												ɪt
2. Grober	kt							tɪ	t				ɪt
3. Guarnerio	kt				xt	ɣt							ɪt
4. Meyer-Lub.	kt		kɪ	cɪ									ɪt
5. Bourciez	kt				xt							ɣt	ɪt

6 Sch-Beh.	kt			ʃt	ɹt
7 Brunot	kt			ʃt	ɹt
8 Pope	kt	xt	çt	ʃt	ɹt
9. Dauzat	kt	xt		ʃt	ɹt
10. Grammont	kt	ct		ʃt	ɹt

The attempt to explain the graduation of this phonetic change is made by seven of these scholars, viz. Grober, Guarnerio, Meyer-Lubke, Bourciez, Pope, Dauzat and Grammont. These analyses show certain differences. Without prejudice to the order in which they occurred, when we compare the Latin *ct* with its ultimate form in Old French, these are the changes involved (1) a stop is lowered to a semivowel, (2) a velar is palatalized, (3) a surd is voiced.

I. A stop is lowered to a semivowel—The steps from stop to semivowel are stop, fricative, semivowel. All except Grober and Grammont of the seven linguists quoted above who analyze this process, specify a close surd fricative, *x* or *ç*, as an intermediate stage. For example, LLat *nokte noctem* > GR *noxte*, faktv *factum* > GR *faxto*. Grammont voices the stop and passes through sonant fricative to semivowel, saying of the sonant stop that 'il s'est spirantisé sur place en un phonème qui ne pouvait que se confondre avec *y* [i], dont il était très voisin'.¹ In the *Travé* a similar statement is made. The divergence here is that all except these two regard the surd fricative as the first step toward the semivowel. The evidence favors this, as has been shown by other scholars.

Various devices were employed for indicating a post-dorsal fricative, e. g. Greek *χ* and roman *ch* and *h*.

(1) In Gaulish inscriptions the Latin *ct* was represented by *xt* e. g. in *Rextum* for Lat. *Rectum*. The Greek had developed a spirant pronunciation by the second century A. D.² Such then we may assume it was intended to represent in Gaulish.

(2) The British and Gaelic branches of Celtic also opened the *k* before *t* to a spirant, e. g. Lat. *octo*, OIr *ocht*, Welsh *wyth* uɪθ, Lat. *rectum*, OIr *recht*, OW *rhaith* ɹaɪθ. The Welsh *θ* seems to indicate a previous fricative stage of the *k*.

(3) In Irish and Welsh the labial stop also was fricated before dentals. Thus -*pt*- > *xt*/*çt* in the former and *ɹt* in the latter, e. g.

¹ Grammont 355, *Le français moderne*, 1939

² Edgar H. Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin* 77, Linguistic Society of America, 1940.

Lat. *septem*, OIr *secht*, Welsh *saith* *saiθ* Brugmann assumes for this an intermediate stage of *ft*, which is logical in view of similar changes in Italic dialects, e. g. Lat. *scriptas* Oscan *sc̄rftas*, Lat. *scriptum* Umbrian *sc̄rehto*³ It is evident that the *p* could not have become a velar stop before it became *f* in the course of its ultimate conversion in Old Irish into a dorsal fricative and in Welsh into a palatal semivowel.

This change took place in a large part of Romania, but mostly in Celtic regions. Moreover, frication of other consonants confirms this as a normal tendency, e. g. Lat. *patrem* > OF 'peðre, Fr *père*, Lat. *ripam* > OF 'rive, Fr *rive*, but only between sonant phonemes.

Where did the surd fricative originate? The retention (tension, tenue) of the *k* is out of the question since this is mute. The on-glide of the mute stop is usually sonant after a vowel, e. g. in Eng. *æt at*, Fr *mok moque*.

What about the off-glide? In English the glide is suppressed between two voiceless stops, e. g. in *æktər actor* and may be also in French, e. g. in *aktœ:r acteur*, but not usually between words in French. For example there is a surd interval between the mute retentions of *k* and *t* in *chaque table*, and this is the surd release of the *k*. It contains therefore an incipient *x* or *ç*, according to the quality of the eliminated *k*. It would be the insistence on, and fortification of, this *k*-release as the simpler transition from the vowel to the crescent stop that eliminated the retention, i. e. the closure, of the first stop.

This, however, does not exclude the possibility of replacement of the *k* (retention and release) by a fortified surd on-glide, although this accords less with Latin and Romance phonological structure.

This elimination of the closure was the more easily effected because the *k* here occupies one of the weakest positions possible, that of a decrescent consonant between a vowel and a crescent consonant.

II. A velar is palatalized —The chief divergence of opinion concerning palatalization concerns the manner in which it occurred. Was the velar drawn forward by the dental to palatal position? This, Nyrop, Guarnerio, Bourciez, Schwan-Behrens, Brunot, Dauzat, and Grammont favor by statement or implication.

³ Brugmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik* 1.515

Or was the dental drawn back to palatal position and did it then palatalize the velar? Thus Meyer-Lubke

Or was there a reciprocal attraction that palatalized the two more or less synchronously? Thus Grober and Miss Pope

Dauzat refers to 'l'évolution du groupe *ct* en *yt* > *it* par l'intermédiaire d'une spirante analogue au *ch* dur allemand.'⁴ Grammont makes this comment concerning Dauzat's remark 'Le *ch* dur allemand *x* étant une vélaire ou une vélapharangale n'aurait pas pu devenir *j*. Le *c* devant *t* était déjà prépalatal, c'est à dire articulé en avant du sommet de la voûte palatine . . .',⁵ but he does not state on what grounds he regards the *k* as 'déjà prépalatal' Surely *ch* is not prépalatal before *t* in German *acht*

Dauzat assumes that the velar stop was fricated before palatalization, *xt* should therefore be regarded as a step in the process of change. He omits the second step, viz. of palatalization before replacement by a semivowel, but it seems to the writer that this is implied. Grammont leaves no room for a surd fricative, which must have existed.

It is impossible to settle categorically the question which occurred first, the frication or the palatalization since there were no means of distinguishing a postdorsal from a mediodorsal stop or fricative. Nor is it possible now to determine what distinctions were made in *κ*, *γ*, and *χ* in Greek and *k* and *g* in Latin, when in contact with velar and with palatal vowels, since the same letters were used in both cases. Sturtevant concludes that these consonants were all velars remarking however 'Before front vowels both *c* and *g* were probably articulated somewhat further forward, but there is no reason to suppose that the difference was important'.⁶ He symbolizes these by *k* and *g*, which in the IPA are ambiguous, since they cover *k* and *g* in *ku:l cool* and *ku:l keel*, *gu:s goose* and *gu:s geese*.

S. bases his conclusion for Greek upon a statement by Archinus ap. Syrianus that *k* is formed with the arched tongue pressed upon from the back of the mouth.⁷ Such a statement for an isolated *k* depends for its significance upon what form of the phoneme the

⁴ Dauzat, *Tableau* 23.

⁵ Grammont 355, *Le français moderne*, 1939.

⁶ Sturtevant, *Pronunciation* 90, 167-9.

⁷ Syrianus, *Commentary on the Metaphysics of Aristotle* (Kroll) 191. 29-35.

writer had in mind. To cover the various allophones of any phoneme in a modern language would require discriminations and would have, no doubt, in ancient languages also.

In view of the later palatalizations of the post-dorsal consonants before palatal vowels in Romance and Romanic we seem justified in assuming that in the early Christian era there were at least as great differences as we find, for example, in modern French, Spanish, Italian, German, Russian, and English.

Kent goes further than Sturtevant. He concludes that 'before palatal vowels (*e, i, y*) the palatal stop was sounded in Latin, before back vowels (*a, o, u*) the velar stop was sounded, but before *a* the consonant was made far less back than before *o* and *u* . . .' And referring to the early inscriptions. 'Hence came the practice of writing *c* before *e* and *i*, *k* before *a*, *q* before *o* and *u* . . .'⁸

On the other hand it is certainly not impossible for velar consonants to persist in contact with palatal vowels and vice versa. A phonetic nexus that may seem difficult and discordant in isolation may form an essential and distinguishing constituent of a particular language, somewhat as certain discords may of a particular musical composition.

Thus we find in Welsh the velar fricative *x* after palatal vowels, e. g. in *lêx llech* 'slate,' *gwiix gwïch* 'squeak.' Spanish has maintained the velar *x* before palatal vowels, e. g. in *'xesto gesto*, *xï'tano gitano*. In Russian the palatalized consonants may precede any vowels, e. g. in *ʎotke* 'aunt,' *ʎuzine* 'dozen,' but without more or less perceptible interglides such nexus can scarcely be maintained. Moreover *t*, initial in the syllable, does not palatalize normally in Gallo-Roman.

So we should expect the *k* before the *t* to retain its velar quality, and while we may at least assume that it might have been and probably was more or less palatal after the palatal vowels, it was not palatalized in this position, e. g. *succum* > OF *sek* (Fr. *sec*). So it was certainly not at first palatalized after velar vowels, e. g. in *noctem*, *fructum*.

It is evident, moreover, that such differences of position as those for *k* after velar and after palatal vowels, might affect the resultant fricative. So that a prevelar *k*, e. g. in *'tekto tectum*, might become *ç*, and a velar *k*, as in *okto octo*, might become *x*, as occurs in

⁸ Roland G. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin* 52 f, 36 f, Linguistic Society of America, 1932.

German in similar cases, e g in *liht* *Licht* < IE *leuk-*, *axt* *acht* < IE *okt5*:

The problem then is to account for the palatalization of *x* to *ç*. Miss Pope's conclusions are sound and complete. She says 'In the inter-vocalic group velar and dental . . . the palatalisation of both elements took place in Gallo-Roman by mutual assimilation. The velar consonants were drawn forward into a palatal position by the influence of the juxtaposed dentals and in their turn palatalized the dentals . . .' And further, referring to the entire group of palatalizations of *k* and *g* before all the predorsal and apical consonants 'These palatalizations all took place after the *plosive* velars had become *fricative*, e g after *-kr-* had become *yr*, *kt*, *xt* . . . and consequently it was the fricative palatal [*j*] that was formed out of them . . .'⁹

Phonetically the striking and apparently anomalous phenomenon here is that the *t*, in the strongest of all positions, should succumb in any degree to the assimilative influence of the decrescent *k*, e g. in *tractare* > GR *trag'ter*. Such phonological anomalies occur not infrequently to confound the phonetician. Somewhat similarly, in Pre-Aryan any oral constriction back of the alveoles caused a sequent dental *s* to move back to an alveolar position, e g. IE *ks* > Skt. *kʃ* in *bʃiakʃatī* 'he eats', Skt. *ʃt* > *ʃt* in *uʃta* 'burnt.' Even more to the point, a mutual assimilation of *p* and *s* to *fʃ* appears in Pre-Iranian, e g. Pre-Aryan *napsu* > Gthav *naffu*: 'descendants' loc. The *s* has caused the *p* to fricate and a velar element in the *p* has retracted the *s*.

III A surd is voiced.—The third change is from surd to sonant, i. e. from *ç* to *j*.

The chief difficulty here is the vocalization of a surd stop or fricative. All of the more recent studies, viz. those of Bourciez, Schwan-Behrens, Brunot, Pope, Dauzat and Grammont assume an intermediate stage of fricative *j*, but the point where sonance begins varies.

In five cases it is at fricative *j*. But Grammont makes the change directly from the stop *c* to *j*, citing Lat. *lacrima* > It. *lagrima* as an instance of surd to sonant stop in confirmation of *-ct-* > *j**t*. But even in Italian there are many instances of the retention of the surd, e g. Lat. *sacra*, *supra* > It. *sacra*, *sopra*. And especially,

⁹ Pope, *From Latin to Modern French* §§ 324, 319.

here we have a different setup, since the surd stop in *lacrima* is inclosed between sonants and has therefore no surd contact to impede its vocalization.

The main objection both to *ç* > *ɣ* and *c* > *ʝ* is that from earliest times the change was of the opposite character, i. e. a sonant preceding a surd stop in an intervocalic nexus became surd. For example *g* > *k* in IE *jukt̥s* 'harnessed' ptc., *d* > *t* in IE *petsu* 'feet' loc. Brugmann says concerning this phonetic principle 'Dieses Lautgesetz ist in allen idg. Einzelsprachen lebendig geblieben.'¹⁰ Its effects may be seen in derivatives of **jukt̥s*, e. g. in Skt. *juktá*, Gk. *ζευκρό*, Lat. *junctu*, Lith. *junkta*.

Lat. *bs* and *bt* were regularly pronounced *ps* and *pt*, e. g. in *urbs*, *obtinnit*. Compare with these also Fr. *opt̥çē obtient*, *ap̥st̥ene abstenez*, with a lenis *p*—as probably also in Latin. In Italian the stop was completely assimilated, e. g. *ot̥t̥ame ottiene*, *ast̥e'nerte astenete*.

English, to be sure, deviates more than the Latin and its filiations, e. g. in *ob̥t̥eɪn obtain*, *æb̥st̥eɪn abstain*, but even here, while the retention of the sonant stop is sonant, the release is mute or surd, as it is also for the other sonant stops, e. g. for *g* in *'bægpaɪp baggage*.

On the other hand, neither in French nor English does a surd become sonant before an inviolate surd. For example, in sandhi *z* > *s* (lenis) before *t* in Fr. *treize tables* and *d* > *t* (lenis) before *p* in *grande porte*, and internally when the *s* became *z*, the *k* became *g*, as in Fr. *egzam̥ē* < Lat. *eks̥c̥imen exāmen*, and so too when the *f* is pronounced *ʒ*, the *k* becomes *g* in Eng. *lag̥'ʒu:ɪəs luxurious*.

But the change in question is not one of vocalization, but of replacement. There is before the *ç* a glide which may be surd or sonant, i. e. the sonance may stop as soon as the aperture begins to close, thus producing a surd interglide, or it may continue until the aperture diminishes to the fricative dimension, thus producing a sonant interglide.

If sonant, its quality will be affected by the position of the consonant and before a palatal will be *ɹ̥*. This subaudible *ɹ̥* offers a more direct route than the *ç* does from the vowel to the depalatalized *t*, since it is less closely attached to the palatal position. It was reinforced, and it replaced the *ç*.

¹⁰ Brugmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*² 1 623

It is true that two or even three consonants occurred in some instances after the semivowel ɹ in Old French. For example ts in $\text{pe} \text{ts}$ (*poux*) < *pucem*, $\text{no} \text{ts}$ (*noix*) < *nucem*, also $\text{st} \text{ɹ}$ in $\text{ku} \text{'no} \text{ɹ} \text{st} \text{r} \text{e}$ (*connaître*) < *cognoscere*, and nt in $\text{s} \text{ā} \text{nt}$ (*saint*) < *sanctum*, $\text{f} \text{ē} \text{nt}$ (*feint*) < *finctum*, $\text{pu} \text{nt}$ (*point*) < *punctum*. But the ɹ is in none of these cases due to the following consonant—as it here appears, viz. as t , s , n —and is not articulated at the same locus. It could not therefore in any sense replace the consonant as an equivalent. It was reinforced, and it replaced the ç .

Similar changes occur in other Romance areas. Old Portuguese especially offers an instructive parallel and contrast.

Here also the k of *-ct-* was attracted to palatal position by the t , fricated to ç and then eliminated by the preceding ɹ -glide, e. g. *lectum* > *leito*, *noctem* > *noite*. But contrary to the French the k was sometimes velarized and then lowered to x/x' by a preceding velar vowel, unrounded or rounded. In this case also it was replaced by the preceding glide, but now the latter, instead of ɹ , was a semi-vocalic u after a , and u after o . The familiar phoneme (rounded u), as was to be expected, replaced the u , unfamiliar as a phoneme, since the u and u differ only in their labial configuration. Examples *actum* > *auto*, *doctum* > *douto*.¹¹

In adjacent Celtic regions, also, the fricative stage of this change is clearly manifested in Gaelic and British, e. g. ekt > $\text{c} \text{ɹ} \text{t}$ in Welsh 'perfa'θ. Lat. *perfectus*, okt > $\text{ɔ} \text{ɹ} \text{t}$ in $\text{d} \text{ɔ} \text{ɹ} \text{t}$. *doctus*, ukt > $\text{u} \text{ɹ} \text{t}$ in $\text{fru} \text{ɹ} \text{t}$. *fructus*.

It seems unnecessary to assume in these cases as intermediary between the close surd and the sonant semivowels a fricative sonant in violation of the principle stated by Brugmann. Neither Guarnerio nor Meyer-Lubke do so. It is also hard to see on what grounds Grammont can base his voicing of c to ɹ before the t .

Accordingly the formulae offered for the changes in question are:

1. (pal. vow.) + *ct-* = kt > çt > $\text{ç} \text{ɹ} \text{t}$ > $\text{ɹ} \text{t}$
2. (vel. vow.) + *ct-* = kt > xt > $\text{ç} \text{ɹ} \text{t}$ > $\text{ɹ} \text{t}$

These formulae might have been broadened to include g as well as k , and the other apicals (d , s , l , r) as well as t , but it would carry us beyond the scope of this article.

They differ from all except Miss Pope's in making the assimila-

¹¹ E. B. Williams, *From Latin to Portuguese* 84 f., Philadelphia, 1938.

tion of the k and t mutual and synchronous and from Miss Pope's and most of the others in dispensing with the fricative j.

The salient points of the change are

- (1) The mutual attraction of the postdorsal x and the apical or predorsal t
- (2) The suppression of a fricative by a semivocalic on-glide.

EDWIN B DAVIS

Rutgers University

THE FARICAL ELEMENTS IN *INFERNO*, CANTOS XXI-XXIII

The atmosphere of these cantos has best been described by Vossler, *Die göttliche Komödie* II, 695 seq., who characterizes it as 'farcical' ('hollisches Lustspiel,' 'schnurriges Durcheinander,' 'drastische Situationskomik,' 'Posse') it is an atmosphere in which sinners and guards (the devils) alike, and even the two poet-wanderers, are for the moment on one level—all subjected to the comedy whose setting is a trough of pitch. But Vossler has failed to explain *why* Dante chose to insert this strange interlude, unique of its kind, into his solemn poem, introducing thereby a break in the otherwise grim tone of the *Inferno*; he fails to show the ties which nonetheless bind the farical episode to the framework of the *cantica*.

As is always the case with Dante's artistic devices, there is an intellectual justification for this respite granted the reader (much akin in tone to the atmosphere of relaxation present in the farical scenes of the mystery plays—which, too, are built around the escapades of devils) this lies in the nature of the crime itself with which Dante deals in the three cantos *Baratteria* (which is only approximately rendered by such modern terms as embezzlement, graft, low intrigue, misuse of power and money) is essentially a *petty* crime—one of which any man may be 'capable.' Therefore do we have this levelling of sinners and their guardians: the delinquents and the authorities are equally unheroic in their reciprocal attempts at cheating. those who punish in the name of the law, as well as those who are punished, form *one* contemptible crew—above whom there stands out no great figure. For Dante (who, by

his curiosity, has unleashed the riot¹ and confusion, the "drastische Situationskomik") goes so far as to include himself in the farce, when for a moment he seems to resign himself humorously to the prevailing atmosphere, as he joins the parade of the devils, that parody of knightly corteges *Ma nella chiesa Co' santi, e in taverna co' ghrottoni* ('one must howl with the wolves'), nor does Vergil himself escape quite unscathed, since he falls a victim to one of the devils' tricks.

Indeed, this overpowering force of an unheroic situation, which stains even the noblest, is precisely the definition of the farce. In the purest examples of the farce (from its beginnings with the O Fr *Garçon et l'Aveugle* to the masterpiece of this genre, the *Avocat Pathelin*), no character is allowed to rise above the standard level of mediocre wickedness, no higher principle of a transcendental, or even of a common moral nature, is allowed to appear on the horizon with the utter ruthlessness of untranscendental comedy man is represented as singularly stripped of his suprahuman qualities—wallowing in the pitch and mire of his infrahuman nature. Not only do we see *homo homini lupus* (everyone cheats the other), man himself is *lupus*, no divine grace shines through the farce. It has always appeared to me a great problem that the same Middle Ages, which elaborated the highest forms of mystic, religious and transcendental poetry, could also create the most barren and shallow picture of man. But to raise the question is to answer it in the vast hierarchy of human types more or less illumined by Divine Grace, there must needs be a place for the variant of the entirely God-forsaken.²

¹ It is perhaps not too bold to assume that the idea of the 'riot' was suggested to Dante by a verbal association. *baratta* 'riot' (the word used by his Vergil xxi, 63)—*barattieri* 'barators' The pedantry which is so often encouraged by the law of the *contrappasso* is, in this case, surely not mitigated by the suggestion of a verbal origin. And yet it is still possible perhaps to sense, in the sentence that must have flashed before Dante's mind ('The barattieri must be presented in a baratta!'), a trace of the innate hatred against the sin in question. Indeed the whole law of the *contrappasso* or talion is the result of a transformation of hatred against a personal enemy (who has sinned against one) into hatred against the principle of this sin itself, and from this hatred emanate juridical and theological consequences.

² It would seem, then, that our own time, devoid as it is of strong religious belief, harbors a sentimental opposition against the naked harsh-

The farce reduces the low nature of man to a hopeless *absurdum* of futile low intrigue and bodily impurity, offering this picture with no relief for the spectator. It is characteristic that Dante, when he quietly reviews (beginning of canto XXIII: *io pensava così*, etc.) the confusion of tumbling, sprawling bodies which he had witnessed and in which he had become unwittingly entangled, should have been reminded of the 'Aesopian' fable in which a powerful *tertius gaudens* or *troisième larron* outwits two small deceitful beasts—one of which kills off the other. In this devil-scene, the parallel to the *tertius gaudens* is ultimately the pitch of Hell (and in the foreground there is parallelism of movements).³ Here the ultimately triumphant force is that of Evil. It is to be noted, too, that Dante formulates the gist of this scene in terms of a *fable*—that rationally prosaic genre which, like the farce, reduces all illusions about mankind *ad absurdum*, in this the fable differs from the *Tiersage* (e g the Renart epic), whose comfortably and naively sinning protagonist, an anticipation of the unheroic Panurge type,⁴ is not 'grace-forsaken' as are the characters of a farce.

Dante, well-aware of the kinship between farce and fable, knows also the fitting place that should be allotted to these in the hierarchy of genres. In this case, he has woven a farce into the contexture; but we are clearly given to understand that this comic scene, devoted to the debased aspects of human life, is only an interlude. At the beginning of canto XXI he alludes to incidents *che la mia commedia cantar non cura* (this is slightly reminiscent of the wilful *de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme* of the great Spanish epic nar-

ness of untranscendental farce (this opposition may also explain why commentators are so reserved in their appreciation of these cantos—note the exceptionally cursory "argument" with which Grandgent introduces canto XXII), we can tolerate such a theme only when sugar-coated—i e, alternating with 'idealism,' as in modern musical comedies and burlesque shows. To the degree that we have lost the fierce resoluteness of faith, we must adopt a sentimentalized approach to what Dante could look upon unveiled in all its God-forsakenness and present without extenuations.

³ Grandgent's comment in this connection is as follows—

"The fall of the two grappling fiends into the pitch is a reproduction of the plunge of the tethered quadrupeds into the water, and their rescue, as they are hooked out by their mates, is a counterpart of the seizure of the frog and the rat by the kite"

⁴ Cf my article "Die Branche VIII des *Roman de Renart*," *Arch. rom.* 1940, p 206 seq

rator), intimating thereby that the farce scene which is to follow may be considered as a whimsical inclusion—as a *farcome* (in the literal sense of farce) a ‘stuffing’ for his *Commedia*. Moreover, in spite of their partial involvement in this scene, the two wanderer-poets cannot but stand aloof from the farcical interlude into which they have strayed. Dante’s temporary ‘relaxation’ was primarily benevolent, Dante’s guilt consisted only of (artistic and moral) curiosity in itself a noble motive. And from the first moment after he had entered this *bolgia* (XXI, 27 *cui paura subita sgaggharda*) to the last (XXIII, 23 *e’ ho pavento*) he depicts himself as frightened (as would be any righteous man faced with moral impurity), at times his fears are presented comically, but it seems clear that he is experiencing a real terror of the defiling contact of vulgarity. His main attitude seems to be that he, the man, should flee from the vile (XXI, 25 *l’uom cui tarda Di veder ciò che gli convien fuggire*), and thus the two poets manage finally to do (XXIII, 33. *Noi fuggirem l’imaginata caccia*). Here the problem of the artist and moralist who must see the gross reality needed for creation, without being caught therein, comes to a solution: flight is the only means for the preservation of his purity.⁵ But in

⁵ The final escape of Dante from the wiles of the devils suggests to Grandgent’s mind “a bit of autobiography”. “In reality . . . , as in the Comedy, he had a narrow escape from infernal machinations.” But if Dante had wished to introduce an autobiographical allusion, he could have done so already in canto XXI, where he describes the crime of barratry—for which he himself had been sentenced to death by the Florentine authorities, here as nowhere else was an opportunity to suggest a personal parallel. Yet Dante failed to take advantage of this opportunity—as an artist he purposely eliminates from his work all elements extraneous thereto. This reticence on Dante’s part, however, does not seem to deter the supporters of the biographical approach.

And when they are so modest as only to include “a bit” of biography in their analysis, I am afraid their attempt will meet with utter defeat. They single out only one aspect of a situation in Dante’s life and parallel it with a similar incident in Dante’s Comedy, without asking themselves how far this parallel applies, or whether an emphasis on the aspect in common between the two may not vitiate the true significance of the situation in the work of art. As for the first: how does the personal experience of the man Dante, who barely escaped seizure by the Florentine authorities, square with this scene in the Inferno where the barrators are ridiculed along with the authorities, and where Dante remains aloof both from the sinners and from their persecutors? And to emphasize the ‘narrow escape from

a *pure* farce, escape from the eddies of vulgarity is forever denied to all

Another element in Dante's peculiar adaptation of the farcical is the theological justification which is introduced. Several times during this interlude Dante has taken care to emphasize the pre-ordained and providential in the devilish horse-play that is enacted the comical rôle the devils must play is willed by God. For, unless God so wills it, they have no power on man, Vergil is assured that he is secure from their attacks

"Credi tu, Malacoda, qui vedermi
Esser venuto," disse il mio maestro,
"Securo già da tutti i vostri schermi,
Senza voler divino e fato destro?
Lasciane andar, che nel cielo è voluto
Ch'io mostri altrui questo cammin silvestro

and in our scene the pride of Malacoda is dashed immediately after he has heard God's will he is forced to drop his pitch-fork It is well known that in Christian drama, the Devil, the power of Evil, is regularly represented as a comic character, precisely because he is conquered in principle by the Good (it is this optimistic trend of Christian dramatic art which is responsible for its basically undramatic nature cf Lanson, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la tragédie*) In this epic poem, too, concerned as it is with the fate of humanity, the Devil has his well-allotted place and limit: the lines put into his mouth (xxi, 112)

Ier, più oltre cinqu' ore che quest' otta,
Mille dugento con sessantasei
Anni compie, che qui la via fu rotta

date the advent of Christ's rule with mathematical precision (1260 years + 1 day + 5 hours have passed since the death of Christ, at which every moment the might of Hell was forever broken). The limit of the Devil's power is set by Providence (xxiii, 55):

Che l'alta Provvidenza, che lor volle
Porre ministri della fossa quinta,
Poder di partirs' indi a tutti tolle

infernal machinations' is to mislead us in regard to the real elements of the conflict to which Dante is given up in this scene i.e. on the one hand his intellectual and artistic curiosity, on the other, his desire to avoid contact with vulgarity Not only does the biographical approach fail to help us better to understand the scene. it leads to absolute misunderstanding.

Thus the farce introduced by Dante is God-willed, God-limited, God-judged. It has a definite place of its own in the Holy poem, to achieve which 'Heaven and Earth have collaborated.' Dante could shape the remotest corners of his creation protected by Divine blessing.⁶

LEO SPITZER

DECAMERON VIII, 9 CARAPIGNARE

The word occurs in that hilarious account, full of *gergo* and obscure double meanings, of a practical joke played upon Maestro Simone doctor, who falls victim to Bruno and Buffalmacco and learns at their hands the meaning of "andare in corso." Those two inveterate pranksters have got their man just about where they want him.

Il medico, che oltre modo desiderava d'andare in corso, non mollo mai che egli divenne amico di Buffalmacco, il che agevolmente gli venne fatto, e cominciògli a dare le più belle cene ed i più be' desinari del mondo, ed a Bruno con lui altresì, ed essi si carapignavano come que' signori li quali, sentendogli bonissimi vini e di grossi capponi e d'altre buone cose assai, gli si tenevano assai di presso e senza troppi inviti, dicendo sempre che con uno altro ciò non farebbono, si rimanevan con lui.

Fanfani's note is typical of dozens of others in his commentary.

si carapignavano come que' signori. Parlare oscuro e forse erroneo; non avendolo niun commentatore spiegato né dettoci chi diavol possano essere *que' signori*, né sapendolo io indovinare.

Massera closes his *Nota* to the *Scrittori d'Italia* edition of the *Decameron* with this comment on the word.

Salutiamo anche senza rimpianto una mezza dozzina di vocaboli che, nati da una sbadataggine di amanuense, erano entrati nel lessico per colpa di quella non mai abbastanza deplorata idolatria per le deformazioni dei testi a penna: *poco-fila*, *trasorier*, *guidicio*, *sanctio*, *balco*, *borrana* e più straordinario di tutti, l'impagabile verbo *carapignare*! Questo è introdotto da *L* [the famous Manelli ms.] e dalla vulgata nel passo di II, 166, 24. "ed essi si carapignavano come que' signori" in *B* [the Berlin ms. which serves him as basis for his edition] la quinta lettera della parola fu espunta (ed il punto di espunzione fu creduto dal Mannelli costituire la gamba di

⁶ On the well-devised farcical names of the devils cf. *Rom. Rev.* xxxiv, 256.

una p) mentre sulla quarta e su parte della quinta l'amanuense tracciò segni che sembrano voler trasformare le lettere stesse in una m, ma non così bene, che le due aste anteriori non tradiscano ad incerta lettura un' a, d'onde appunto *carapignavano*

Finally Michele Barbi in his fundamental essay on the text of the *Decameron* (1927),¹ in part a critical review of the Massera edition, questioned Massera's alteration of *carapignare* to *carmignare* and observed

contro l'ipotesi del Massera sta il fatto che noi non possiamo far derivare tutti i manoscritti che leggono *carapignavano* o *carpignavano* o in simil modo da Mn [Mannelli] sono molti e di varie tradizioni, e fra questi è anche l'autorevolissimo Parigino 482, che è sì del medesimo gruppo di Mn-B, ma proviene dal capostipite per via affatto indipendente. Non può il Boccaccio, essendo qui in vena di foggare nomi e vocaboli insoliti, aver derivato *carapignare* o *carpignare* (nel senso stesso di *carminare* o *carmignare*) dal francese antico *charpigner*? o averlo trovato nell'uso per un incrocio di *carmignare* con *carpire*? e se *carmignare* o *carpignare* dicono lo stesso nel senso proprio, non può averli usati indifferentemente anche nel senso figurato qualunque sia? Io credo che se il Massera vorrà salvare il suo *carmignare*, sarà costretto a pensare a una trascrizione del *Decameron* di mano del Boccaccio nella quale l'autore stesso a *carapignare* abbia sostituito la lezione ch'egli Massera preferisce.²

Now a very clear photographic reproduction of the passage in the Berlin ms where Massera claims to read *carmignare*, reveals an unmistakable *carapignavano* to us. It may be that the original shows erasures which justify Massera's remarks. Fortunately however the studies on the complete manuscript tradition of the *Decameron* have now reached a point where we can distinguish several other manuscripts equal in authority to the Berlin Ms. And in every one of these we find the form *carapignavano*. In fact every ms. of the 14th Century has this except one, which has a variant reading supported by no other *si gli facevano*. Later mss reflect misunderstandings and interpretive readings such as "si godevano," "si rifacevano," "si racompagnavano" "si cham-

¹ In *Studi di filologia italiana*, I, 9 ff.

² *Op cit*, pp. 49-50. Since we have witnessed Fanfani's perplexity over the construction *come que' signori*, it is appropriate to quote Barbi's note which offers the correct explanation.

"Perché, nello stesso luogo, mette il Massera punto e virgola fra *come que' signori*? Non abbiamo qui una formula corrispondente al *quippe qui*, come coloro che ecc ?"

pignavano." One ms of the 15th Century has the form "scarpignavano"

In the various notes to this word before Massera there has been little understanding of its meaning, instead there have been offered only guesses at a possible meaning (While it is true, as Fanfani notes, that our story *in general* is full of a *parlare oscuro*, still this word can hardly be a case in point, occurring as it does outside of direct discourse) But Massera's reading cannot stand and we must face the form *casapignare*.

Its meaning and derivation become clear if, to the philological information which heretofore has been exclusively offered, we add the linguistic knowledge acquired in the last generation, i e the materials contained in the REW and the FEW. In the first we find the entry (7663):

scarpinäre * C GL L 5, 399, 11 'schaben'

Rum *scarpina* 'kratzen,' engad *sk'arpiner* 'zupfen,' mail *scarpina* 'zerzaust'—+ PILUS 6508 sp *escarapelarse* 'sich zausen'—Mit Suff W piem *skarpená*, gen *skarpená*, engad *sk'arpul'er* 'zeizausen'

The FEW s v. *carpere*, I, 1, b-c, lists O Prov. *carpenar* 'effiloche du lin,' O. Fr. *charpiner* (hapax of the 14th cent.), dial. Fr (é)*charpi(g)ner* 'faire de la charpie, déchirer, égratigner, mettre en menus morceaux, tourmenter, chercher querelle, se disputer' and (é)*charpiller* 'mettre en charpie, déchiquter,' and remarks on the suffix

Das suffix von b schwankt (-enar, -inar, -igner, -eigner). Der ausgangspunkt ist sehr wahrscheinlich nicht überall der gleiche Sicher ist, dass sowohl *carminare* (besonders im suden) als auch *peigner* an der entstehung des worttypus beteiligt sind c ist mit dem verbalsuffix -iller gebildet, das besonders in *fendiller* in einem semantisch sehr nahe liegenden verbum lebt

Barbi, who mentions the Fr. word, was evidently on the right track, but we may be even more positive in our affirmation the presence of a Milanese *scarpiná*, Piedm. *skarpená*, Engad. *sk'arpiner-sk'arpul'er*, all parallel to Fr (es)*charpigner-iller*, allows us to

* Why -i? The word is attested only once and then in an Anglo-Saxon gloss (cf. *Arch f lat. Lew* I, 287) which does not permit of any inference. The Romance reflections point as well to -i- (O. Prov. *carpenar*), as to -i- (Rum *scarpiná*)

assume the existence of an Italian (and Florentine) **(s)carpignare*, **(s)carpighare*, which would represent an **(ex-)carp-in(i)are* (cf. also It *carminare*, *carmignare*, Parma *skarminar*, REW s.v. *carminare*) and an **(ex-)carp-ihare* respectively. The *scarpinare* of the Anglo-Latin gloss is in fact nothing but a Romance **ex-carp-inare* (Meillet-Ernout, *Dict. étym. de la langue lat* s.v. *carpō*)—cf. *scoriscus* = *ex-coruscus*. For our verb it is necessary to assume neither a formation of a loanword from French nor a blend with *carmignare*. Boccaccio has simply used a genuine popular or dialectal word which may possibly yet turn up in other parts of Italy.⁴ The *scarpignare* of the 15th cent. variant shows an *s-* which is in line with the forms listed above and serves to prove that at this late period the word was still understood.

Thus, with a clear indication of the literal meaning *si grattavano* before us but with no other example of the Florentine *carapignarsi* at hand, we can only depend on the context to define the figurative meaning which the verb must unquestionably have here. Bruno and Buffalmacco are jubilant. They have just brought the doctor to the point of seeking out Buffalmacco himself, and they can now gull him properly in their usual good team work. With the fine wines and fat capons and many other good things spread before them by their very victim, they are "tickled to death" in anticipation of greater success. *Si carapignavano* expresses this contentment. Applied to this pair of mutual abettors and admirers, the verb is surely reciprocal. *si grattavano l'un l'altro dalla contentezza* seems to be the idea. The standard *grattarsi la pancia* as an analogue helps to glimpse the meaning. *Carapignarsi* is probably a stronger expression (as *carminarsi* instead of *grattarsi* would be). To make it reciprocal instead of reflexive probably added much comedy to it. One is reminded of a passage in Marot which seems to provide something of a similar situation.

Ce Huet et Sagon se jouent
Par escript l'un l'autre se louent

⁴ Cf. meanwhile Piedm. *carpúgn*, *carpógn*, Milan *carpógn* 'arido' ("propiam 'rammendo,' deverbale di mil *carpogná* 'rammendare,' il quale pare un derivato di *carpere*, come fr. a *charpigner* . . . , con senso mutato per infusso di mil *poncigna* 'agucchiare,'" A. Levi, *Diz. etim. del dial. piem.*), cf. also Salvioni, *Rev. d. dial. rom.* v, 177, Milan *carpiáss* 'rapprendersi, cagliare, gelare' may be a **carpighare*.

Et semble (tant ils s'entrefflissent)
Deux vieulx asnes qui s'entegrattent⁵

In fact, Marot's *s'entegrattent* seems to be the best possible gloss to Boccaccio's *carapignarsi*

CHARLES S. SINGLETON
LEO SPITZER

BIAUS NIÉS

Bloch (*Dictionnaire Étymologique*), after giving the literal sense of the adjectives *niais* as "pris au nid," finds the modern, figurative meaning—perhaps relying on Latré—only "depuis le xv^e siècle." There is an example, however, in Godefroy's *Complément* from a thirteenth century manuscript, Chartres 620, which Godefroy wrongly identifies as a copy of *Dolopathos*. Actually this is a fragmentary version of the rhymed *Roman des Sept Sages*, and our word occurs both here and in the only complete manuscript known of that work, Bib Nat fonds français 1553

Et dont n'est il bien fols niais,
Quant il le [= la pelote] giete et cort apris?

Moreover, although these two manuscripts are of the thirteenth century, the poem itself is usually dated in the twelfth¹

That in any case the figurative meaning of even the substantive is surely as old as the thirteenth century is indicated by a pun in Adam le Bossu's *Jeu de la Feuillée*, a pun which seems somehow to have escaped notice. In that play Walet, referred to as *sot*, *beste* and in need of Saint Acaire, patron of fools, keeps addressing everyone indiscriminately as "biaus niés," whereupon the Monk, mocking him, uses the same expression—more appropriately—in speaking to Walet himself. Now the latest editor of the play, Langlois,

⁵ In the *épître* "Fripelippes, valet de Marot, à Sagon."

¹ The Chartres ms reads. Et dont n'est il bien fol niés / Quant il la giete et cort après. See *Le Roman des Sept Sages*, ed Jean Misrahi, Paris, 1933, l. 2447, and for the Chartres ms. Hugh Smith's diplomatic copy in *RR* III, 1912, l. 286. The date of the latter is discussed by P. Meyer in *Bulletin de la SATF*, 1894, p. 37. On derivations from *nidus* meaning "child," see Ivan Pauli, "Enfant," "Gargon," "Fille" dans les langues romanes, Lund, 1919, pp. 352-354.

like his predecessors, is content to gloss *niés* by *neveu* and to dismiss the expression in his notes as "un mot de Walet" But, although the words "sœur" and "frère" were frequently employed in medieval French in greeting strangers, *niés* (= nephew) is recorded only in its literal meaning It seems clear therefore that when Walet says "biaus niés" the audience, who also heard "biaus niais" (as in this position had of course become open *e* before the thirteenth century), smiled both at the fool's ascription to others of his own folly and at his impudence in thus addressing such worthies as Maître Henri, the Monk, and Saint Acaire.

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

NAZI UND SOZI *

I

Daß *Nazi* eine Abkürzung von *Nationalsozialist* ist,¹ ist auch in der englisch sprechenden Welt weithin bekannt, viel weniger aber, daß diese "Abkürzung" gleichzeitig als parodistische Replik auf das Jahrzehnte alte, sehr gebräuchliche Spottwort *Sozi* (Abkürzung für *Sozialdemokrat*) geprägt wurde. Für jeden, der sich zur Zeit des Aufkommens des Nationalsozialismus im deutschen Sprachgebiet aufhielt, bestand darin der Witz des Wortes. Obwohl Leo Spitzer 1934 in "La vie du mot *nazi* en Français"² auf diesen Ursprung hingewiesen hat, scheinen seine Ausführungen, wohl wegen der Entlegenheit des Erscheinungsortes, unter Germanisten kaum Beachtung gefunden zu haben.

Danach war *Nazi* als parodistische Analogie-Bildung zu *Sozi*

* Dieser Aufsatz ist der, dem Rahmen dieser Zeitschrift angepaßte, zweite Teil eines Vortrags "Word Formation by Shortening and Affixation," gehalten am 17. Juli 1943 an der University of Wisconsin anlaßlich des gemeinsamen Meetings der Linguistic Society und American Dialect Society. Der erste Teil erschien unter dem zitierten Titel in *American Speech*, XVIII (1943), 200-207.

¹ Und zwar eine Verkürzung des Wortes auf seine ersten zwei Silben, aber nicht eine Zusammenziehung aus "Nationalsozialist," wie Webster's *New International Dictionary*, Second edition, es darstellt.

² *Le Français Moderne*, II (1934), 263-268.

besonders geeignet, weil die baurische Koseform *Nazi* für den katholischen Namen *Ignaz* im Oberdeutschen leicht einen komischen Beigeschmack hatte, Schmeller, *Bayerisches Wörterbuch* führt die Redensart *Haßs* (*heiß*), *Nazi* an, "üblicher Ausruf, wenn man sich gebrannt hat," Hermann Fischer, *Schwabisches Wörterbuch* erklärt *Nazi* als einen spottischen Ausdruck für "dummer, tappischer Kerl," und nach dem *Schweizerischen Idiotikon* bedeutet *Nazi* "wunderliche Person" Ferner sei *Nazi* in Wien (um 1900) scherzhafte Umschreibung für das persönliche Furwort der ersten Person gewesen *Nazi* (*Nazerl*) *tut das nicht* habe Professor Spitzers Vater im familiären Umgangston verwendet — Soweit jener Artikel.

Warum aber hat der Beiklang des Kindischen innerhalb des traditionellen Gefühlswertes "dumm, (baurisch-)tölpisch," der im Oberdeutschen dem unpolitischen *Nazi* anhaftete, so stark überhand genommen, daß das Ergebnis jene scherzhaft infantile Ausdrucksweise wurde? (*Nazi tut das nicht* mit dem Sinn *Ich tue das nicht* ist ja deutlich Nachahmung der Kindersprache.) Es ruht dies offenbar von der Verknüpfung dieses Namens mit zwei Gestalten der oberdeutschen dramatischen und literarischen Tradition her. Die wollen wir hier bekannt machen.

Johann Nestroys Posse *Eulenspiegel*² (1838) erlangte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert, von Wien ausgehend, ungeheure Popularität. Ihr Verfasser, Liebling und Meister der Wiener komischen Bühne, spielte in ihr die Rolle des *Natzi*. Diese Modernisierung der alten *Thaddädl*-Figur, die eine Erneuerung *Kasperls* und *Hanswursts* gewesen war,³ wurde selbst eine typische Gestalt. Otto Rommel, der beste Kenner oberdeutscher Volksstück-Tradition, berichtet:

Die Aufführung dieser Posse . . . muß ein Fest des Übermutes gewesen sein . . . Nestroy spielte den "Thaddädl" *Natzi*. Aber wo blieb die harmlos kindliche Frohlichkeit . . . ! Der langmächtige Nestroy [im Kostum eines Knaben] redet dumm, lacht tölpisch, wundert sich . . . , wird geprügelt und erhebt ein entsetzliches Zetergeschrei . . . Aber er hat Momente, wo man sich sagt: Dieser blode Junge ist gar nicht eigentlich

²In Johann Nestroy, *Sämtliche Werke*, hgg. von Fritz Brukner und Otto Rommel, ix (1927). Wir zitieren diese Ausgabe als SW.

³Vgl. u. a. Rommel, *Johann Nestroy, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wiener Volkskomik*. In SW, xv (1930), 263 ff, ferner das Kapitel "Kasperl und Thaddädl"

„dumm,“ ja er überrascht oft durch entschieden geistreiche Bemerkungen. Man erkennt er ist nicht „dumm“ im intellektualistischen Sinn des Wortes, er ist mehr stumpf — hat aber längst gelernt, sich in einer Einschätzung wohlzufühlen, die alle Vorteile der Verantwortungslosigkeit gewährt. Dieser Natzl war tolpisch und verschmitzt zugleich. Das gab allerdings eine Komik, die von Nestroy gespielt, immer wieder genossen werden konnte. Der freche Knabe Willibald⁴ ist das Endglied der langen Reihe, die mit Natzl beginnt⁵.

dieses unbedeutende Stück wurde eine der erfolgreichsten Possen Nestroys überhaupt und ging Jahr für Jahr über die Bühne. So groß war die komische Gewalt, die von diesen beiden Künstlern [Nestroy und Scholz] ausging⁶.

„Jahr für Jahr“ bedeutet hier den Zeitraum von 1838 bis 1860.⁷ Dies macht begreiflich, daß die Rolle sich dem Bewußtsein jener Zeit so tief einprägen konnte, daß *Natzl tut das nicht* in die ironisch scherzende Umgangssprache übergehen konnte, wie so viele andere Wendungen und Typen aus Nestroys Stücken. In Mittel- und Norddeutschland mag die Wirkung weniger nachhaltig gewesen sein. Nestroy spielte den Natzl 1843 in Breslau, 1844 in Berlin, für die lange Reihe seiner berühmten Gastspiele in Norddeutschland nach 1844 haben wir keine Zusammenstellung.

War in Nestroys Darstellung das Kindische innerhalb der Assoziationen betont, die sich an den Namen *Natzl* knüpften, und diese Gesamtheit von Assoziationen selbst durch satirische Untertöne zweideutig gemacht, so stellt ein anderes österreichisches Werk der Zeit die wohlwollend lachelnde Auffassung eines unreifen, ungewitzten baurischen *Natzl* dar: Josef Missons vielgelesenes *Versepos Dá Názl, a niederösterreichischer Bauernbui, geht in d'Fremd* (1860).⁸ Lange Auszüge daraus waren noch in den 1920er Jahren in den offiziellen

⁴ In *Die schlimmen Buben in der Schule*, SW, XIII; bis in die letzten Jahre immer wieder in öffentlichen und Liebhaber-Aufführungen gespielt.

⁵ SW, xv, 263 ff.

⁶ SW, ix, 565.

⁷ Dies zeigt die Statistik der Aufführungen von Nestroys Werken an drei Wiener Theatern, SW, xv, 399-419. Sie schließt mit 1862, Nestroys Todesjahr. Über Wiener Aufführungen nach 1862 wissen wir nur so viel, daß im Rahmen des 48 Abende umfassenden Nestroy-Zyklus des Carl-Theaters im Jahre 1881 auch *Eulenspiegel* wieder auf die Bühne kam. (Vgl. M. Necker, *Johann Nestroy* in Band ix der Ganghofer-Chiavacci'schen Ausgabe von Nestroys Werken [1891], 211.)

⁸ Auch in Daberkows Allgemeiner Nationalbibliothek. Vgl. Nagl, Zeidler, Castle, *Deutschösterreichische Literaturgeschichte*, II, 607 ff. und *passim*.

österreichischen Gymnasial-Lesebüchern enthalten Erinnerungen an den Knaben Parzival, Meier Helmbrecht, Simplizius Simplizissimus umspinnen die Hauptfigur mit einer Reiner Tor-Atmosphäre, in der das Alberne gemildert erscheint

Nestloys Natzl und Missons Naz waren als literarische Figuren zur Zeit der Entwicklung des Nationalsozialismus schon vergessen, dem Namen aber haftete der Beiklang des Lächerlichen, manchmal des Verachtlichen, noch an Dies ist erwiesen durch den—unpolitischen—Gebrauch in Witzblättern und eine Fülle von Wörterbuchdefinitionen und -Beispielen Wir führen hier noch einige an, um den ganzen Bereich der spottischen Anwendung des Namens sichtbar zu machen Das *Schwabische Wörterbuch* (1914) gibt mit den Redensarten *dummer als N*, *der tappet N* die Erklärungen "Gaunername," "Wer Absonderlichkeiten hat," "heimtückischer, bosartiger Mensch" und die Wendung *Es ist recht, N* als "hohnische Antwort auf einen Befehl," "Schelte für einen Menschen, der etwas falsch gemacht, der einen geärgert hat" Der Nachtragsband bringt ferner *Näzl*, *Drecknäzl*, "Schmutzfink"

Das *Schweizerische Idiotikon*, IV (1901) bezeichnet *Näz*, *Näzel*, *Näzelh*, *Näzi* als Personennamen und Appellativum. Maskulin gebraucht, bedeute es "Toller," *Zapfe-Näzi* (n.) einen beschränkten Menschen

Martin-Lienhart, *Wörterbuch der elsassischen Mundarten* (1899) schließlich führt unter *Naz*, . . . Koseform *Nazi* u. a. die Redensarten *du N du dummer!*, *du bist'e tauwer* [tauber] *N*. und die Bezeichnungen *Drecknazel*, *Kasnazel*, "Junge, der Kase ißt und sich dabei . . . beschmiert," *Krappe⁹nazi*, "Spottnamen für einen zerlumpte Menschen" an.⁹

So gehörte *Nazi* zu jenen Vornamen, die, nicht ernst genommen, oft einen bestimmten abfällig oder humoristisch gesehenen Menschentypus bezeichnen. Man erinnere sich etwa *Kasperls* (*Kaspar*), des albernen, unreifen *Thaddädl* (*Thaddaus*), des verblüfften, ungeschickten *Nannerl*,¹⁰ (Koseform von *Anna*), des zaghaften *Veidl* (*Veit*),¹¹ des Clowns *August* und der festen Fugung *verrückte Greil* oder *Gredl*.

⁹ Alle diese Wortverbindungen waren um 1914 in Freiburg (Baden) noch durchaus üblich. (Laut Dr. Bernhard Nebel, University of Rochester Medical School.)

¹⁰ Vgl. Schmeller-Frommann, I, 1745, ferner die Dialektwörterbücher von Hugel und Castelli.

¹¹ Vgl. Schmeller-Frommann, I, 692.

Abkürzung des Parteinamens, parodistische Analogie und alltägliches Schimpfwort zugleich, war *Nazi* in den Anfängen des Nationalsozialismus eine willkommene Waffe der Gegner,¹² besonders im Suden,¹³ der Heimat der Bewegung. Die in Bayern und Württemberg erscheinenden und im ganzen deutschen Sprachgebiet verbreiteten Witzblätter *Jugend*, *Simplizissimus*, *Fliegende Blätter* und *Meggendorfer Blätter* hatten aber den in einer vagen Weise lacherlichen Namen *Nazi* auch schon längst im Norden vertraut gemacht, als er zunächst von der Sozialdemokratie als Revanche für *Sozi* aufgegriffen wurde.¹⁴ So verbreitete er sich rasch als Spottwort und dann als handlich kurze Bezeichnung wie einst *Sozi*. Die den politischen Begriff umwitternde Bedeutungsschwere, der täglich hundertfaltige Gebrauch im immer politischer werdenden Alltag, wirkten dahin, dass der traditionelle Beiklang und bald auch der Ursprung des Wortes rascher in den Hintergrund traten, als es sonst in wortgeschichtlichen Entwicklungen der Fall ist.

So wurde aus dem Spottnamen *Nazi* innerhalb der Partei, solange sie in der Opposition stand, da und dort ein Trutzname wie einst *les gueux* > *Geusen*, bis schließlich die Machtergreifung und die Gleichsetzung des Nationalsozialismus mit dem Staat solchen Gebrauch für seine Anhänger unnötig und für seine Gegner gefährlich machte. *Nazi* durfte nicht mehr verwendet werden.¹⁵ Wo aber

¹² Provinziell konnte noch eine vierte Assoziationsgruppe mitgespielt haben. *Nazion*, Kurzform *Natz* ist alemannisch "Volk, Leute" pejorativ. *Des ist eme böse Natz*, ein schlimmes Volk. *Heut hat er wieder seinen Nazionalstolz*, zeigt wieder seine ganze Einbildung, Hochmut." *Schwäb. Wb.*, Nachtrag.

¹³ Es war laut *Schwäbischem Wb.* in seinen pejorativen Anwendungen aus dem angrenzenden katholischen Schwäbischen auch ins Frankische gedrungen.

¹⁴ Paradoxe Weise war sie in ihren Anfängen selbst mit dem doppeldeutigen *Nazi* belastet worden. In Wilhelm Buschs "allegorischem Zeitbild" *Pater Filucius*, einer politischen Vers-Satire, heißt der international eingestellte Sozialdemokrat, der ebenso wie die katholische Kirche (*Pater Filucius*!) als Feind des deutschen *Michel* vorgeführt wird, *Inter-Nazi*: "Pater Luzi, finster blickend, / Heimlich schleichend um das Haus, / Wählt zu neuem Rachezwecke, / Zwo verwogne Lumpen aus — / Einer heißt der Inter-Nazi, / Und der zweite Jean Lecq, / Alle beide wohl zu brauchen, / Denn es mangelt Geld im Sack." 2. Aufl. (1873), 29.

¹⁵ Vgl. W. L. Shirer, *Berlin Diary*, 495, Eintragung 2. September 1940.

die Partei verboten blieb, wie in Österreich, da wurde als herausfordernde Geste der Name von den Anhängern gelegentlich weiter gebraucht¹⁶

Zur Zeit jenes Verbotes war *Nazi* schon längst aus dem bloß deutschen Sprachgebrauch herausgetreten. Die Ausbreitung des Wortes auf verschiedenen Sprachebenen des Englischen z. B. bedurfte einer eigenen, sich weit ins Politische verzweigenden Studie. Die fortschreitende Identifizierung von *Nazi* mit *German*, abhängig vom Grade politischer Bildung und von der Sprechsituation, und die Anwendung des Ausdrucks zur Bezeichnung einer politischen Haltung, losgelöst von spezifisch Deutschem, sind die Hauptmerkmale dieses Prozesses vom Gesichtspunkt des Bedeutungswandels. Er ist grundsätzlich gleich dem von *Bolschewik* im Deutschen und *Red* im Englischen.

II

So wie *Nazi* in den Anfängen seiner parodistischen Anwendung als Abkürzung bereits einen reichen politischen Bedeutungswert hatte, so ist auch sein Modell *Sozi* zuerst mehr als eine Kurzform für *Sozialdemokrat* gewesen. Denn „grober *Sozi*“, unter dem Stichwort *Sozi* im Schmeller-Frommannschen Wörterbuch (1872-1877) angeführt, war schon lange eine stehende Wendung gewesen, festgehalten bereits von Schmeller, der 1852 starb. Sie geht auf *Socus*, „grober, roher Mensch“¹⁷ zurück, das im Index zu Schmeller als gleichbedeutend mit *Sozi* behandelt wird. Während *Socus* in dieser Bedeutung zumindest im Österreichisch-Bayrischen des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts weit verbreitet war und in den volkstümlichen Komodien des Zeitraumes häufig belegt ist,¹⁸ konnte

¹⁶ So erschien z. B. „illegal“ herausgegeben von der verbotenen Hitlerjugend in Österreich ein *Nazi-Katechismus* (*New York Times*, Jan 9th, 1938, 24). Andere Beispiele bei Spitzer, *l. c.*, 264—Uns scheint es sich in diesen Fällen um das alte polemische Mittel zu handeln, die Sprechweise des Gegners zu verhöhnen (Berühmteste Beispiele die *Epistulae Obscurorum Virorum* und Pascals *Lettres Provinciales*). Ähnlich verwendet das *Schwarze Korps*, Organ der *SS*, das verbotene Wort noch jetzt, um die Gegner der Partei zu parodieren: „No one can expect the State to condemn more and more Nazi functionaries just to make the Mullers of Germany happy.“ (*Inside Germany Reports*, issued by the American Friends of German Freedom, 1942, No. 22, 2.)

¹⁷ Nach F. S. Hugel, *Wörterbuch des Wiener Dialektes*

¹⁸ Vgl. den Beleg aus Schikaneder aus dem Jahr 1793 in Nestroy, *SW*, ix, 607 (Anhang). Ferner Nestroy, *Eine Wohnung ist zu vermieten* (1837),

ich die Form *Sozi* nur bei Schmeller finden. Als Diminutiv ist es offenbar die spätere Form, und so mag seine Bedeutung "Grobian" im Laufe weniger Jahrzehnte vom politischen Sinn des Wortes aufgesaugt worden sein.¹⁹ Jede Abkürzung von *Sozialdemokrat* mit herabsetzendem Gefühlswert wäre wohl als scherzhafte oder satirische Bezeichnung lebensfähig gewesen, aber eine vielfach bewußt zur Schau getragene Eigentümlichkeit in den Umgangsformen der Sozialisten muß den (groben) *Sozi* zur besonders willkommenen doppelsinnigen Bezeichnung gemacht haben. Das häufig betont un-"bourgeoise," un-"geschliffene" Auftreten der Parteianhänger.

Schmeller bemüht sich, die Bedeutungsverschlechterung von *socius* soziologisch oder kulturgeschichtlich zu erklären.²⁰ Obwohl seine zweite Erklärung, aus dem katholischen Kulturkreis abgeleitet, als Stütze das für sich hat, daß *Sozus*, "grober Mensch" nur oberdeutsch belegt ist, glaube ich, daß die Analogie zum Bedeutungsabstieg von Wörtern semantisch ähnlichen Ursprungs wie *Gesell* (*Raubergesell, sonderbarer Gesell, was für ein Gesell!*), *Kumpen*, *copain*, *fellow* ihn ausreichend erklärt. Die Vorstellung von den traditionellen *Sozis* ist auch mit betonter proletarischer *Gefahrten*-schaft verknüpft, und eine Pikanterie des Sprachgebrauches fugte es, daß sie einander mit einer Übersetzung von *socius* anredeten: *Genosse*.

Das als oberdeutsches Diminutiv-Suffix wirkende *-i* hat dem *Sozi* ebenso wie dem *Nazi* viel von der beabsichtigten Würde der ursprünglich zugrunde liegenden Formen geraubt und wird der Übernahme des Spottwortes im Norden Deutschlands förderlich.

I Akt, 15. Auftritt. "Der grobe Hausmeister CAJETAN. Ös Weibsbilder seids alle unter meiner Würde. LISETTE. Er ist ein Socius, mein Freund, Er sollt' sich ein Beispiel nehmen an dem Hausmeister hier im Haus, der hat eine Art" (*Ausgewählte Werke*, hg. v. Franz H. Mautner, 141).

¹⁹ Die Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei wurde 1869, die Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei 1875 gegründet, das Aufsehen erregende "Sozialistengesetz" war von 1878 bis 1890 wirksam. Um 1900 war *Sozi* im politischen Sinn gang und gäbe.

²⁰ "Etwa von *socius divvorum*, Gesell des Kirchherrn? oder aus der Zeit der Jesuiten, von denen nach den Ordensvorschriften, wo möglich, keiner allein, sondern immer mit einem *Socius* wohnen, reisen, agieren sollte?"

gewesen sein, wo *Socius* als "Grobian" vermutlich unbekannt war. Veistummelte Kurzformen, welche die bei der Namengebung wirkenden Begriffe nicht mehr erkennen lassen, sind brauchbarere politische Waffen als die offizielle Parteibezeichnung des Gegners. Diese wird oft zu viel Programmatisches enthalten, das für den Angreifenden annehmbar sein konnte *sozial, demokratisch, national, sozialistisch* in unseren Fällen. "The decrease in the logical content of the word involves an increase in its range of applicability."²¹

FRANZ H. MAUTNER

Hobart and William Smith Colleges

WIENERISCH REMASSURI

Schmeller, *Bayr Wb* s. v. *Remassori*, *Remassuri* sagt

(Wien) Ausgelassenheit der Kinder und des Gesindes in Abwesenheit der Eltern. *Castelli Wbch* 219 *die Remassori*, Seidl, Flins [erln] (1839) II, 79 102 *das Remassuri*, Larm, Gepolter

Castelli, Worterbuch der Mundart in Osterreich unter der Enns (1847) glossiert (*die*) *Remassori* 'ein lustiger Larmen, z. B. *Machd's drausten kan so a Remassori*' griech. *βρεμειν*, angels. *hrgman* [']. Hugel, *Der Wiener Dialekt* (1873) hat *Remasori* 'wirres Gejohle, larmende Unterhaltung,' Schranka, *Wiener Dialekt-Lexikon* (1905) *Remasuri* 'eine tolle Geschichte' (mit Beleg aus einem Lied von C. Lorens. *Ist wo a Hetz, a Gaude, Wie ma sagt a laute Remasuri*). Mir persönlich ist nur mehr die *u*-Form gelaufte und die Nuance von Larm kombiniert sich für mein Gefühl mit 'Getu, Geschichtenmachen, Aufhebens'. Ein Wiener Freund definiert "*Ramasuri* ist Unordnung, 'Wirtschaft,' z. B. 'es tut mir so leid, dass ich dich heut nicht zu Tisch einladen kann, aber es ist Wasche und dann ist immer eine solche *Ramasuri* zuhaus'. E. Sachs in *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht* 32, 78, die die Fremdwörter im österreichischen Deutsch behandelt,¹ bespricht nicht dieses Fremdwort, teilt mir aber privatim mit, dass für sie der

²¹ E. H. Sturtevant, *Linguistic Change* (1917), 89.

² Ich erinnere mich in *Zeitschrift des Ferdinandeums* eine den Aufsatz E. Sachs' vorwegnehmende, aber mehr katalogisierende Studie von Th. Gartner s. z. gelesen zu haben (mir hier nicht zugänglich)

semantische Kern des Wortes 'Wirrwarr, Patsche, unlosbare Situation' (= engl. *mess*) ist und die normale phonetische Form *Ramassuri*—die offenbar von der Dialektform für 'raumen'—*rama* volksetymologisch beeinflusst sein muss²

Wir haben hier einen Ableger des mittel-lateinischen Juristenwortes *litterae remissoriales* 'quibus de re aliqua inquisitio, examen, vel iudicium, ad aliquem remittuntur' (Du Cange), *remissoria* 'iudicium, sententia repudiata' (Bartal, *Glossarium . . . latinitatis regni Hungariae*),³ span. *remisória* 'despacho con que el juez remite la causa ó el preso á otro tribunal' (*Dicc. acad., Dicc. de autoridades*), ital. *remissoria* 'patente con cui si rimette ad altrui alcun atto giuridico' (Tomm-Bell), cf. frz. *lettres rémissoriales* 'celles dont le but était de renvoyer, par-devant un juge, l'examen d'une affaire' (*Larousse du XX^e s.*), *rémission* 'Überweisung eines Prozesses' entsprechend mittellat. *remissio* (Du Cange, s. v. 2), engl. *lettre remissory* oder *remissive*, und letztlich *causam ad senatum remittere* bei Tacitus. Es handelt sich also um einen semantischen Kommentar, mit dem sich das Volk an dem lastigen (ex-) österreichischen Heiligen Bürokratius racht, die Ursprungssphäre weit hinter sich zurücklassend die Verweisung eines Streitfalles an einen anderen Gerichtshof wird vor allem als Belastigung, als überflüssiges Getue und Gerede, als 'tolle Geschichte' aufgefasst, und von da geht der Weg unbehindert weiter zu 'Larm, Ausgelassenheit.' Vgl. die von E. Sachs aufgezählten, in Wien volkstümlich gewordenen Juristenwörter *jem koram nehmen*, *ein Nisi* etc. Eine genaue semantische Parallele in der gemeindeutschen Volkssprache ist *Fismatenten* 'Flausen, Umstände, Ausfluchte' aus *visae patentes* (*litterae*), "durch spottische Auffassung des Bürokratischen" erklärt in Kluge-Gotze

Das weibliche Geschlecht, das Castelli betent, ist das des lateinischen *remissoria* [*littera*]. Den -i- Ausgang bezeugt E. Sachs reichlich in einheimischen und entlehnten Wörtern des Wienerischen. Man muss bedenken dass hd. -e, "wenn es bleibt und nicht durch r oder n in a verwandelt wurde (*glocka* 'Glocken,' *oda* 'oder'), zu einem kurzen i" wird, z. B. *a schaini* (schöne),

² Der "Sprach-Brockhaus" (1935) gibt für unser österr. Wort ein mask. Geschlecht an, das mir ungebräuchlich scheint

³ Cf. zur Ellipse von *litterae* dtsh. *Patent* aus *litterae patentes*, frz. *missive* 'Sendschreiben,' span. *ejecutoria* 'Adelsbrief' und *petitoria* 'Petition' (mittellat. *petitorium* Du C.) und oben im Text deutsch *Fismatenten*

schweichi (Schwache), *gudi* 'gut' Adverb, *kuaraschi* . . . (Courage), *pumadi* 'Pomade, gleichgültig,' Nagl, *Gramm Analyse des mederost Dial* (1886), S 42 u 199. *Couraschi*, *Bagaschi*, *Modi* (bei Seidl), *marodi*, *Spadi* (it *spade*) in *Spadifankei* 'teuflisches Kind' sind also lautgerechte Dialektvarianten von im Hd eingebürgerten Fremdwörtern (wogegen *Courasch*, *Bagasch*, *Blamasch*, *Mariasch* direkt aus dem Frz stammen) Hinzukommen nun im Wienerischen -i- Formen in Fremdwörtern aus dem Italienischen (*Gschpusi* > *sposi*, *Lazzi*, *Schani* > *Gianni*) und Lateinischen Dass auch lateinische Fremdwörter sich mit -i- Ausgang begnügen mussten, zeigen *salfawern* 'mit Erlaubnis' < *salva venna*, 'die kleinen guten *Ordinari*-Seelerln' (Nestroy, *Talsman* II) < *ordinarius*, *Notari* (in Hofmannsthal's "Rosenkavalier"), der Name *Paphnuzi* bei Seidl, ⁴ *Negozi* (< *negotium*), *Spezi* = *Spezialfreund*, *Sozi* 'Socius' (in Wien gebraucht vor der allgemein deutschen Einnennung aufs Politische) Ob *Zigori*, *Kumodi*, *Histori* von hd -ie- Formen (> u > i) oder von lateinischen (mit Apokope) stammen, lässt sich wohl nicht sagen (ein *Alleziiguri*, das Chiavacci seiner Frau Sopherl vom Naschmarkt als Verballhornung von *Allegorie* in den Mund legt, ist ganz im Sinn dieser Bildungen) Ich habe allerdings den Eindruck dass das -i in den Fremdwörtern oder Wörtern, deren Etymologie nicht mehr klar ist (*Gschpusi*, *Schani*, den Adv. *pomalli* 'langsam,' *lepsi* 'schnell' [aus dem Slav.], *Komodi*, auch in *Stritzi* 'herumstreichender Geck, Zuhalter,' von mundartlich-bayerischem *stritzeln* 'eifertig dahinlaufen'), und auch das diminutive -i in *Rudi*, *Bubi*, *Madi*, *Radi* 'Radieschen' fester im Bewusstsein verankert sind als das -i in *schani*, *schweichi*, *gudi* (= schöne, schwache, gute), dem stets die mehr hochsprachliche -e- Variante zur Seite steht die Mundartdichter die *Kumodi* schreiben, können sich der *schani*- Form enthalten ⁵ Auf diese

⁴ Vgl noch bei diesem die Redensart *in ana Glori und Viktori*, in dem angehängten Wörterbuch übersetzt 'in vollster Wonne und Lust' *Remassuri* selbst habe ich bei Seidl nicht finden können

⁵ Ich sage z B *die Gaudes* für 'eine Hetz,' was offenbar eine hyperkorrekte Bildung für volkstümlicheres *die Gaudi* (< lat *gaudium*, offenbar urspr. Studentenwort) ist, zum Feminin gemacht wegen des -i der Femininabstrakta wie *schweichi*,—"dieser Regel zulieh," wie Nagl sagt. Schranka schreibt *Gaudé*, mit einer französischen Orthographie, die einer sekundären 'französischen' Aussprache entspricht und die Entwurzelung des Wortes gut ausdrückt (cf. die Eigennamen *Rosé*, *Franqué* aus *Róse Fránke*); vielleicht ist auch *Faschee* 'Verdruss' (< frz. *être fâché*) vom Einfluss gewesen—allerdings ist dies maskulin.

Weise kommt das -i- (wenigstens das 'feste' -i-) zur Funktion einer Art gemeinsamen Nenners der Fremdwörter (und der irgendwie fremd anmutenden Wörter wie *Strazzi*)

Man konnte annehmen, dass das Suffix von (*die*) *Remassuri* (mit *u-* aus *-ô-* wie in *Uhr* < *hōra*, frühnd *ure* und *ore*, wienerisch *Jux* = lat. *jocus*, *Schüttentur* volkstümliche Aussprache der Wiener Strassenbezeichnung *Schottentor*) produktiv geworden ist in wien. (*die*) *Kramuri* 'Mischmasch verschiedener unbedeutender und abgenutzter Gegenstände, lastige Trodelware,' eine hybride Bildung von dem einheimischen *Kram* mittels eines Fremdwortsuffixes (vgl. gemeindeutsche Fälle wie *Glasur*, *Sammelsurium* [> deutschem *sammelsûr*, Kluge-Gotze], und *Brumborium*, *Lappalie* etc.), die noch ausserdem an lat. Kollektive wie *centuria*, *decuria* anknüpfen kann. *Remassuri* hat denn sein feminines Geschlecht und seine Bedeutung 'überflüssiges (Getu und Gerede)' an ein *Kramuri* weitergegeben, das die Sprachgemeinschaft halbbekannt anmuten musste als eine Weiterbildung von *Kram* mit einem spielerisch-phantastischen gelehrten Anhangsel, das nun so recht geeignet schien, Belastigung auszudrücken—die Belastigung, die der volkstümliche Sprecher in gelehrten Worten fühlt, die sich seinem Verständnis nicht unmittelbar erschliessen (cf. die Wucherung derselben gelehrten Endung -*orio*, -*ori* in span., portug. und ital. Mundarten, vgl. Verf., *Rev. de fil. esp.* ix, 390). Max Mayer, *Das Wienerische* (1924) fasst *Gramuri* [sic!], trotz der Ableitung von *Kram*, als Lautnachahmung—and das ist sicher das naive Gefühl jedes Wieners auch angesichts *Remassuri*. Dr. Franz Mautner schreibt mir, über sein 'naives Empfinden' über *Remassuri* befragt "dass die Endung -*uri* den Wirrwarr, das Ungeordnete bezeichnet und *remas-* den Lärm . . . Vier verschiedene Vokale in vier Silben, zwei davon starktonig, das gibt schon eine gehörige Klangfülle." Wissenschaftlich betrachtet, handelt es sich um sekundäre Onomatopoesis, um 'Umempfindung' einer Endung ins Klanghafte, die ursprünglich nichts mit Klang (*remiss-oria*!) und eher mit dem Gefühl der 'Befremdung,' die mit jedem Fremdbestandteil eines Sprachsystems verbunden ist, zu tun hatte. Mit dem 'fremdartigen' und 'lärmenden' Eindruck, den dies -*uri* macht, spielt offenbar auch die in Wien kursierende Erzählung, die Schranka s. v. *rama* 'räumen' aufführt: "Der Arbeiter [ich kenne die Geschichte als von einem Pflasterer erzählt, der einem Fremden Auskunft gibt] antwortet auf die Frage, was er da tue: *Rama tur i*, mehrere: *Rama ta ma* und, mit Bezug auf

andere *Rama tan s*'' Ein *ramatur* 'räumen tu ich' (mit dem -r-, das ein Ueberbleibsel des o im mhd. Diphthong *uo* ist) macht den Eindruck eines Fremdwortes⁶ (vielleicht gerade eines vom Schläge unseres *Remassuri Ramassuri*, das selbst, s. oben, unter den Einfluss von *rama* geraten ist), und die humoristische Sprachbeobachtung der mundartlichen Rede freut sich an dem 'echtwienerischen' Wortungeheuer, das dem Fremden unbezwingbar scheinen muss eine Art linguistische Selbstbespiegelung und Betrachtung der eigenen Mundart 'wie von aussen,' die gerade durch deren Fremdwortbestände geweckt wird und zu dem auch sonst reflektierten und nuancierten, richtig 'barocken' Verhältnis des Österreicher zur Sprache stimmt der geographischen Vielfalt des alten Österreich entspricht ein vielschichtiges Erleben der Sprache in der 'österreichischen Seele.'

LEO SPITZER

CHRISTINAS HEIMREISE UND IHR VORBILD

Es ist bekannt, daß der Vorfall, der Hofmannsthals Komödie als Thema dient, in den Erinnerungen Casanovas berichtet wird.¹ Jahre vorher, im *Abenteurer und die Sangerin*, hat Hofmannsthal den aus den Bleikammern entronnenen, sich wieder nach Venedig wagenden Abenteurer gestaltet und den von keiner Liebe gewandelten einer sich bewahrenden und starken Frau gegenübergestellt. Ein anderes Portrat Casanovas, des Junglings auf der Höhe der Lebenskraft, ist in *Florindo und die Unbekannte* festgehalten. Schließlich hatte sich der Dichter in *Silvia im Stern* an der szenischen Situation versucht, die er in *Christinas Heimreise* verwendet, dem Vorsaal des Gasthofs mit den Zimmertüren.² Alle diese Versuche zusammenfassend, wollte Hofmannsthal in *Christinas Heimreise* ein Lebensbild Casanovas gestalten. Der Heimfahrt des in der Heirats Hoffnung

⁶ Dieser Umstand wird auch wohl z. T. erklären, warum Italienisch dem Wiener so viel komischer dünkt als etwa Französisch: die -s-Endungen jener Sprache erinnern ihn an seine eigenen Volkswörter auf -s. — Man vergleiche mit der Einreihung der Fremdwörter in ein Einheitsschema -s etwa den -s-Plural der Fremdwörter im Norddeutschen.

¹ In der *Édition originale, la seule complète*, Bruxelles, 1887. Ende des ersten und Anfang des zweiten Bandes.

² Die ihm, ausser von Lessing vertraut, vielleicht in Moratin's *El sí de las niñas* aufgefallen war.

enttauschten reichen Bauernmadchens und ihrer Verführung in wenigen Stunden mußte ein Umriss des nie zögernden, immer glücklichen, sich verschwendenden Florindo vorausgehen, mit der für den wirklichen Casanova so bezeichnenden Beziehung zu zwei Schwestern. Aber wie sollte das Stück enden? Der *Charles* der Memoiren, den Casanova dem Mädchen für die versprochene Ehe besorgt und statt seiner eigenen unwürdigen Person annehmbar macht, identifizierte sich für den Dichter mit dem von Casanova immer Betrogenen, dem den ein starkes inneres Leben schwer und zurückhaltend macht. In der ersten Fassung von *Christinas Heimreise* (1910) kehrt diese Gestalt, der Kapitän, das ganze Stück um: seine tiefwurzelnde Stärke und Beständigkeit stellt den sich verflatternden, immer gleichen Florindo in den Schatten, ähnlich wie Vittoria den Abenteurer überragt. Aber damit wird aus einer Komödie ein schwerfalliges moralisches Stück,³ und Hofmannsthal, der dies selbst merkte, hat den letzten Akt nie wieder drucken lassen, nur mit einer Andeutung geschlossen, die uns die Wertlosigkeit des immer neuen und immer gleichen Suchens Florindos ahnen läßt. Die Umkehrung der ersten Fassung von einer Komödie in ein moralisches Charakterstück, die Rollenvertauschung zwischen dem Kapitän und Florindo, von denen der eine in den Vordergrund tritt, während der andere verschwindet, beruht auf zwei Ursachen. Einmal fühlte der Dichter beide Charaktere in seinem eigenen Wesen: der Gegensatz zwischen dem sich ans Leben Verschwendenden, der jedem Augenblick und jeder Welle folgt, und dem in sich Gebundenen, als wäre er unfähig zum Leben, geht durch sein ganzes Werk,⁴ und Hofmannsthal wusste, welchem er sein wahreres Leben verdankte. Aber, zweitens, verlangt auch das Lebensbild Casanovas, wenn *Christinas Heimreise* als solches geplant war, ein Gegengewicht. Jeder Leser der Erinnerungen Casanovas ist hingerissen von dem Schauspiel des Lebens, von der wunderbaren Lebenskraft, die sich hier verstromt, er denkt notwendig an Goethe als an ein Bild ähnlicher elementarer Stärke, das uns in gleicher Deutlichkeit vor Augen steht. Aber nach einiger Zeit, wenn alles nur an der Oberfläche bleibt, sich wie Schaum verflüchtigt, und der

³ Richard Alewyn, "Hofmannsthals erste Komödie," im *Jahrbuch des freien deutschen Hochstifts*, Frankfurt a. Main, 1934/5, ist anderer Meinung.

⁴ Sie vereinigen sich im *Schwierigen*, dem, sozusagen, unfreiwilligen Abenteurer, unter der eigenen Maske des Dichters.

Held in der niedrigsten Leere sein Genügen findet, ohne den geringsten Gewinn, beginnt der Leser doch zu zweifeln an dem Wert einer solchen Kraft, die keine Stille kennt und nichts in sich aufzubauen vermag. Auf diese Weise wird der letzte Akt der ersten Fassung von *Christinas Heimreise* mehr gefordert durch die Lektüre und das Lebensbild Casanovas als durch die eigenen Gesetze der Komödie.

WALTER NAUMANN

University of Michigan

TWO OLD ENGLISH WORDS

1 Old Anglian (*ge*)strynd

According to all recent dictionaries OE (*ge*)strynd, fem., meaning 'lineage,' 'line of inheritance,' 'generation,' 'race,' 'tribe,' has an originally long vowel and is connected with *gestrienan*, *gestrēonan*, 'gain,' 'acquire,' 'beget.' Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement* (1921) lists two different meanings and two forms (*gestrēonde*, *gestrýnd*) under *gestrind*, a form never actually recorded, and connects with *gestrēonan*, thus following the practise of the main dictionary, s. v. *strind*. The *NED* in 1919, following Bosworth-Toller, derived *strind* from "OE. (Anglian), *strýnd*, also *gestrēond*, *gistrýnd*, from (*ge*)*strienan*, 'to produce, beget.'" Clark Hall has *strýnd* (= *īe*) in the third edition of his *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (1931). Holthausen (*Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1931) follows his usual practise of listing the word under its supposed Early West Saxon form *gestriend*, a form not recorded for either of his definitions 'Gewinn, Nachkommenschaft.' On the other hand, the vowel of (*ge*)strynd was considered short by Sweet in his *Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (1896) and thus presumably dissociated from *gestrienan*, and it has likewise been considered short by such students of dialect as Cook, Jordan, and Stolz.¹ The dialectologists are, I believe, right; but whether the *y*

¹ A. S. Cook, *Glossary to the Old Northumbrian Gospels* (Halle, 1894), s. v. *strynd*; R. Jordan, *Eigentümlichkeiten des angelsächsischen Wortschatzes* (Heidelberg, 1906), p. 63; W. Stolz, *Der Vokalismus . . . der Ländsfarner Evangelien* (Bonn, 1908), p. 54, cf. S. T. R. O. d'Ardenne, *An Edition of the Lufade ant te Passum of Seinte Iuliene* (Paris, 1936), who correctly derives *strund* from OE. *strynd*.

is short or long, it is plain that the lexicographers could not have connected the word with *gestrienan*, by equating the *y* of (*ge*)strynd with WS *ie*, if they had duly considered the fact that the word is limited to the Anglian dialect

Strynd is cited from five texts in Old English by Bosworth-Toller, usually as a gloss of Latin *tribus* or *stirps*. It occurs five times in the Old English translation of Bede, considered originally Mercian,² twice in the Lindisfarne gospels, the second instance duly copied by Owun in the Rushworth gospels (Matt 19, 28, Luke 22. 30); once glossing *tribus* in the *Durham Ritual*,³ where *soð gestrynd* also appears glossing *progeniem*, this being the only instance of the word with the prefix *ge-* recorded by the dictionaries, and once in the *Blackling Homilies*,⁴ the vocabulary of which shows them to have been originally composed in Anglian.⁵ The only occurrence of the word in the poetry is in the compound *eormenstrynd*, *Solomon and Saturn* 322, where I mistakenly marked the vowel long in my recent edition. So far as I know, the *y* is not marked long in any of the MSS of these texts, but even if it were, this would not determine the length of the original vowel, since the recorded instances are all late enough to have undergone the ninth-century lengthening of vowels before *-nd*.

Because of its appearance in the Anglian texts listed above and its absence from West Saxon texts *strynd* has long been recognized as an Anglian word.⁶ Since *strynd* occurs only in Anglian and is spelled consistently with *y*, the vowel must be i-umlauted $\tilde{y} < \tilde{u}$ that is 'stable' *y*, long or short. Only a LWS *strynd*-spelling could have $\tilde{y} < ie < u$, as in *gestrynan* 'to gain' **gestrienan* < **gestruunan* beside *gestreonan* < *gestrionan* (unumlauted), but the Anglian

² The instances, cited by Deutschbein *PBB* xxvi (1901), 172, are in i, 15 (p 52, l 14 ed Miller, p 42 ed Schipper); iii, 14 (p 194, l 6 ed Miller, p 253 ed Schipper); iv, 22 (p 328 l 17 ed Miller, p. 458 ed Schipper); v, 7 (p 406, l. 10 ed. Miller, p 585 ed Schipper); v, 19 (p 452, l 29 ed. Miller, p 658 ed Schipper)

³ Pp 193, 29, ed A Hamilton Thompson and U Lindelöf (1927), Surtees Society 140.

⁴ P 23, l 28, ed R Morris

⁵ Günther Scherer, *Zur Geographie u. Chronologie des ags Wortschatzes* (Leipzig, 1928), pp 42-43.

⁶ Sweet, *Student's Dictionary*, 'not W', Deutschbein *PBB*, xxvi, 172, Jordan, *Eigentümlichkeiten*, p. 63.

forms corresponding to LWS. **strȳnd* would be Nth **striond*, M **striond*, not *strȳnd*, since (ge)*striona*(n) (Landisfarne and Rushworth II) corresponds to LWS (ge)*strienan*, (ge)*strȳnan*,⁷ Holthausen, if he had cited the only correct form, Angl (ge)*strynd*, instead of an invented WS *gestriend*, could not have compared OHG *gistrumda*, 'officium,' 'lucrum,' to which the normal correspondent in Old English would be *gestrienþ(u)*⁸ One might, of course, indulge in reconstructions in order to relate *strȳnd* or *strynd* ultimately with *strēon* and *gestrienan*, which Walde-Pokorny (II, 640) and the *NED* trace to IE. 'streu and connect with Lat *struo*, *strues* Thus *strynd* presumably from **strundiz* might be considered an extension of a Germanic weak grade **strun* beside e-grade **streun*, but this is hardly justifiable unless there are other compelling reasons. An examination of the Old English material seems to indicate that *strynd* has been unnecessarily forced into relation with *strēon*, *strienan*, and that, although the words came to be popularly associated through convergence of meaning, there is no reason to connect them historically or etymologically.

Do Old English forms with a *d*-suffix, that is *gestrēond*, *gestrȳnd* or *gestriend*, ever mean 'gain,' and do (ge)*strēon*-forms, without *-d*, ever mean 'lineage'? Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement*, s. v. *gestrind*, cites from Wright-Wulker a form *gestrēonde* for the first sense 'gain' (the second sense being 'progeny'), Clark Hall cites the same passage under *strȳnd*; and Holthausen, s. v. *gestriend*, gives the meaning 'Gewinn', but the sole evidence for this meaning in Old English is the gloss in Cotton Cleopatra A III of *questu* as 'gestreonde.'⁹ This is not trustworthy evidence for a word *gestrēond* 'gain,' since it might be a form of the past participle (inst. sing. ? nom. acc. pl. ?), but is more likely to be an error for *gestrēone* in this orthographically not very dependable manuscript. In the corresponding Aldhelm gloss in Royal 5 E XI, *questu* is glossed *gestrēo*, which Napier assumes to be an error for *gestrēon*.¹⁰ Middle

⁷ On the phonology of Luick, *Historische Grammatik* §§ 191.2, the infinitive *striona*(n) actually does not occur in the Northumbrian gospels, but for numerous verbal forms in *to* see Cook, *Glossary*, who lists them under (ge)*strionga*, mistakenly making them all wk 2 verbs

⁸ J. Wright, *Old English Grammar*, 3rd ed §§ 371, 613 Holthausen has of course, followed Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement*, in coalescing two different words into one.

⁹ Wright-Wulker, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, I, 488, l. 30.

¹⁰ A. Napier, *Old English Glosses*, p. 165, l. 69

English forms in *-d* (*strund*, *strund*), derived from *strynd*, never mean 'gain,' but always 'line,' 'lineage,' 'race'

Conversely, (*ge*)*strēond*, though it meant 'begetting' as well as 'gain' in Old English, never meant 'lineage' until Middle English times. Scholars have been naturally misled into trying to connect *strynd* 'lineage' with WS (*ge*)*strȳnan*, verb, and OE (*ge*)*strēon*, noun, because one sense of *gestrȳnan* is 'beget,' 'procreate,' *gestrēon* correspondingly meaning 'begetting,' 'procreation' This leads in the Middle English *strene*, noun (Mod. Engl. *strain*) to the meanings 'lineage,' 'race,' 'stock,' almost exactly corresponding to those of OE *strynd*. Nevertheless, the Old English material points to the fact that, as Bosworth-Toller and the *NED* assume, the primary sense of *strienan* was to 'gain' 'acquire,' and that of *gestrienan* to 'acquire by effort,' the meaning 'beget' being secondary. One may compare the semantic development of *beget* itself In the case of the noun *gestrēon*, the meanings 'gain,' 'treasure,' 'profit,' 'lucrum,' 'emolumentum,' are the earlier and commoner, cf. OHG, OS *gustrum*, 'treasure,' 'lucrum.'¹¹ There is only one bit of evidence, so far as I know, that *gestrēon* could mean 'lineage,' 'stock' in Old English and that is the appearance of the word in MS B (Corpus Christi College Cambridge 41) of the Old English version of Bede (iv, 22) Here, where the Trinity, Cambridge University, and Cotton Otho 13 xi MSS have *strynd* (*he wæs-æþelre strynde. erat de nobilibus*), MS B has *he wæs æþeles gestreones*. This is an error for original *strynd*, since the scribe of B does not know the Anglian word *strynd* and substitutes *cynn* or *gebyrd* in all other instances; but it shows how easily *gestrēon*, 'begetting' could be equated with *strynd* 'lineage.' In Middle English times the two words are used in alliteration in the prose *Juhana*—*streon of swich a strund*, 'descendant of such a race';¹² and in Layamon's *Brut* (*1*)*streon* is used regularly in the sense of 'lineage,' 'line,' *streone* being actually substituted by the scribe of MS B for A's *strund* in 2736. It should be noted that the Middle English forms of *strynd*, normally *strund* in the North and *strund* in the West Midland, the word not being recorded for the South,

¹¹ If the connection with Latin *strues*, and Jordanes' *strava* are correct, as is commonly assumed (cf. Holthausen, s v. *strēon*), the semantic development would have to be 'heap up,' 'acquire'

¹² Ed. S. T. R. O. d'Ardenne, p. 429, l. 529

corroborate the assumption of an OE (Anglian) *strynd* with 1-umlauted *y* from *u*¹³

The chief purpose of this note is to show that OE. *strynd* must be divorced etymologically from *strēon*, *strienan*. If the word seems now to be left unhappily isolated, I may suggest that a more likely relation would be with Scandinavian *strind* and Germanic *strand* which P. Persson traced back to Pre-Germanic *strent-*, *strant-*, an extension of the base **ster* 'to stretch' OE *strynd* from earlier **strundiz* could go back to a corresponding weak-grade *stint-*.¹⁴ It is a striking parallel that Greek *σπαρός*, which originally meant 'clan' 'subdivision of the people,' 'group,' 'crowd of people,' has been traced to **strntós*¹⁵ This reconstruction has been doubted because of the parallel Aeolic *σπορός*,¹⁶ which would seem to show original **stítós*, in which case the connection with *strynd* would be more remote, both being derived from weak-grade but different extensions of the base **ster* But it is certainly noteworthy that so many derivatives of extensions of the base **ster* develop meanings such as 'group,' 'series,' 'clan,' which would be close parallels to *strynd*, 'lineage,' 'tribe.' Persson pointed out that Norw. dial *strind* means 'Streifen, langes, abgespaltetes Stück, Seite, Hälfte . . . Linie, langer Streifen (z. B. in Zeug), Reihe . . . Schar von Walfischen oder grossen Fischen,'¹⁷ and believed that Scandinavian, English, and German *strand*, 'stretch of land,' 'coast line,' represented the *o*-grade of the same base.¹⁸ With *strind* and *strand* he connected, following Windisch, Middle-Irish *trét* 'herd' < **(s)trento-*, and OBulg. *trǫtŭ* 'agmen' < **(s)tronto-*.¹⁹ Besides these related words he adduced many other semantic parallels

¹³ Two unusual forms do appear in the North. *strend* in the Northern Early English Psalter IX, 27 (C Horstmann, *Yorkshire Writers* II, 142) and *strand* in Cursor Mundi, 9497, 10157, both being used in rhyme. The first might, of course, be derived from an OE **strēond*, but is probably a late confusion of *strene* and *strind*. *Strand* is listed as a separate word in *NED*, which suggests that it is an altered form of *strind*.

¹⁴ *Beiträge zur Idg Wortforschung Skrifter utgivna af kungl. humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala* X (Uppsala, 1912), 447-454

¹⁵ F Solmsen, *Glotta* I (1909), 78-79, Walde-Pokorny II, 638.

¹⁶ S Solmsen, p 79, note 1, Persson, *Beiträge*, p 451; Walde-Pokorny II, 638 But the Aeolic form might well be secondary.

¹⁷ *Beiträge*, p 447

¹⁸ An etymology accepted by Hellqvist, *Svensk etymologisk Ordbok*, and Walde-Pokorny II, 638.

¹⁹ *Beiträge*, p 448.

in words meaning 'long series' 'line' and 'group' If OE *strynd* were traced to IE weak grade **strntis* the primary Old English meanings 'line of inheritance,' 'progeny,' 'tribe' would be easily explained as natural developments of the sense 'series,' 'long line' applied to people

2 OE. *gullisc*

OE *gullisc* occurs only once in a late prose text, the *Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn* in Corpus Christi College Cambridge 422, a manuscript dated in the late tenth century.²⁰ It modifies the word *seolfor* 'silver,' but the passage in which it occurs, a fantastic description of the strength and beauty of the Pater Noster, throws little light on its meaning, since the author merely says that the Pater Noster's arms are longer than the earth and its trees even though they should be joined together and gloriously adorned — 'and ānra gehwylc ende [of the *bēamas* 'trees'] sie fram ððrum tō ðām midle mid ðȳ gulliscan seolfre oferworht and mid ðām neorxnawanges compgimmm astāned.'²¹ Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement*, simply lists *gullisc* with a question-mark, Clark Hall in his third edition has '? (an attribute of silver)', and Holthausen similarly writes '(vom Silber?)' with neither definition nor etymology.

Kemble in his edition of the dialogue translated ðȳ *gulliscan seolfre* 'gilded silver,' and I believe he was right.²² If the phrase is not actually a rendering of the medieval *argentum deauratum* of the goldsmiths, it must at least refer to a kind of silver of a golden color. The form *gullisc* must be derived from OWSc *gull* 'gold' with the addition of the native ending *-isc*. *ll* for native *ld* is a test of Scandinavian loan-words, and *gull-* therefore stands to native *gold* as ME *will* (OWSc. *villr*) to native *wild*.²³ There is no corresponding OWSc. **gullskr*, but the Old English might be a modification of the OWSc. *gullgr*²⁴

The prose dialogue, like the poetical dialogues in the same MS,

²⁰ See my edition of *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, MLA Monograph Series XIII (New York 1941), p. 1

²¹ *Poetical Dialogues*, pp. 169-70

²² J. M. Kemble, *The Dialogue of Salomon and Saturnus* (London, 1848), p. 151.

²³ Cf. Björkman, *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English* (Halle, 1900), 169-170.

²⁴ Recorded from four sources by Cleasby-Vigfusson, *Icelandic-English Dictionary*, and J. Fritzner, *Ordbog over det gamle norske sprog*

was originally Anglian,²⁵ so that Scandinavian influence is quite possible. It might be thought curious that such a word should be derived from Scandinavian when perfectly good English words existed such as *gylden*, adj. 'golden,' 'gilt,' or the past participle of verbs such as *gyldan*, *begyldan*, *ofergyldan*, 'to gild.' Ælfric, for example, translates 'in vestitu deaurato' *on ofergyldum gyrlan*.²⁶ But doublets are fairly common, and in this particular case it may be that in Scandinavian England the word was associated with and reinforced by an OE **gul(l)* which became ME. *gull* 'yellow, pale,' known to have been borrowed from OWSc. *gulr*, and recorded from the thirteenth century on.²⁷ It is not likely, however, that the word was really interpreted as 'yellowish,' since the *-isc* ending in Old English is added only to nouns, is comparatively uncommon except when attached to names of lands and people, and does not appear with adjectives of color until around 1400.²⁸ Furthermore, the use of *deauratum* (which became Fr. *doré*) with *argentum* in medieval documents to mean gilded silver seems to show that the origin must be sought in OWSc. *gull* 'gold.'²⁹ OE *gullisc*, preserved by chance in an originally Anglian document, is something of a curiosity because it adds to the small number of borrowings from Scandinavians recorded before 1000, most of which have to do with the sea or legal matters.³⁰

Yale University

ROBERT J. MENNER

²⁵ *Poetical Dialogues*, pp. 18-21, and p. 20, note 17.

²⁶ *Cath. Hom.* II, 586.

²⁷ Björkman, pp. 212, and *NED* s. v. *gull*, adj. obs. Cf. also *gulsoğht* 'jaundice' (OSwed. *gulasót*) and *gulness* 'yellowness' (Björkman pp. 176, 212).

²⁸ H. Koziol, *Handbuch der englischen Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg, 1937), pp. 172-173 and *NED* s. v. *-ish*.

²⁹ J. Texier, *Dictionnaire d'Orfèvrerie*, Migne, *Troisième Encyclopédie Théologique* 27 (Paris, 1857), cols. 174-175, says that a silver vessel might be either *totus deauratus* or *partim deauratus*, the former corresponding to what is called in French *argent (en) verré*. He cites from the 1295 *Inventory of St Paul's* 'calix argenteus per partes deauratus' (W. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum* III, 327 ed. 1673). A glance at the pages of this famous inventory of St Paul's shows many entries of silver vessels thus gilded: see especially Dugdale, III, 311-313, 328-330. *Deauratus* is a common word in medieval Latin; see Du Cange and also J. H. Baxter and Charles Johnson, *Medieval Latin Word-List*, Oxford, 1934.

³⁰ M. S. Serjeantson, *A History of Foreign Words in English* (London, 1935), p. 64, ascribes about thirty loan-words to the period before 1016.

ON FÆDER FEORME, BEOWULF, LINE 21

It is suggested that one read *feorme* instead of *bearme*¹ in *Beowulf* 21, as the meaning of the alliterative *feorm* would fit the context very well. The meaning of *feorm* is in legal texts 'Bekostung, Naturalienabgabe, Bodenzins in Naturalien; Schmaus, Bearbeitung des Bodens,'² in poetic documents 'Gastmahl, victus, Bewirtung, Hab and Gut, usus, fructus'³ and in non-legal prose texts 'food, provisions, stores; a feast, entertainment, use, benefit, profit'⁴, *feormian* is translated by 'bekostigen, beherbergen; dem Gutsherrn Gastung leisten, zu Schutz annehmen, als Vasallen annehmen; unterstützen'² etc.

In looking over the passages containing *feorm*, *feormung*, *feormian* etc., one finds that these words are not only associated with goods and possession, with hospitality and entertainment, with dues and rights (*gytefeorm*, *nihtfeorm*, *feormfulum*), but also with support, protection and shelter given to a man who is looking for another lord (Alfred 37 *tó men feormian*) as well as to a fugitive and banished man⁵ (see *fliemanfeorm*, *fliemanfeormung*; *wreccena feormung*, Alfred 4)

Substituting *feorm* for *bearm*, the passage *Beowulf* 20 ff would read:

Swá sceal (geong g)uma góde gewyrcean
fromum feohgiftum on fæder feorme
þæt hine on ylde eft gewunigen
wilgestðas þonne wīg cume,
léode gelæsten

Gewyrcean may be connected with *feorm* in the same way as *wyrcean* or (ge)gierwan in the following sentences. *man þære sunnan feorme worhte*, Hml. Th II 494, 6 *ðonne ðu feorme gierwe on ælmessan*, Past. 232, 22; *he gegearwode micle feorme*, Mk. 6, 21. Whereas *feohgiftum* and *feorm* reminds one of the ancient formula

¹ For the various interpretations of this passage see J. Hoops, *Kommentar zum Beowulf*, Heidelberg, 1932, p. 9 ff

² Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, II, 69.

³ Grein-Köhler, *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter*, 190 f

⁴ Bosworth-Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary*, p. 280, and Supplement, p. 213.

⁵ *he ðær (f)or feorme feorhwunde hleat sweordes swengum, sumu Hygelaces*, Be. 2385.

'*mīd feo and feorme*,' '*feoh oððe feorm*' (*gewiton him ða eastan æhta lædan, feoh ond feorme*, Gen 1650, *ðu sweltan scealt mīd feo ond mīd feorme*, Gen 2659, *oððe feo oððe feorme*, II Cn 16, A), the association of *feoh* and *feorm* is rather loose in *Beowulf* 21, the accusative *feorme* is here linked with the verb *gewyrca*⁶

This interpretation of the construction of the sentence Be 20 ff, which differs from that generally accepted, also necessitates a different explanation of the construction of *on fæder*. In the two passages *gif man cuman feormæð III. niht an his agenum hame*, Ll Th 1 32, 16 and *butan ðæs biscepes leafe, ðe hr on his scire gefeormade sin*, Bd 4, 5, S 573, 5 the preposition *on* apparently has a local meaning, but also *on* is used with the person from whom something is taken away,⁷ *on fæder*, accordingly, may be rendered by the expression 'from the possessions of his father, through the means of his father.'

That a child may make use of the property of the father to make gifts, is borne out by a passage of the *Edda*. Gerd, the daughter of Gymir, in refusing a ring, gives as a reason that she does not lack any gold in the home of Gymir, as she can distribute the money (the possessions) of her father *era mer gullz vant i gerdum Gymis, at deila fe fœður*, For Skirnir, 22.

The translation of *Beowulf*, line 20 ff. would then run as follows
Thus shall a young warrior practice hospitality (protection and munificence) through good deeds, through splendid gifts from his father's (possessions), so that . . .

Fritz Mezger

Bryn Mawr College

STANZA CONTINUITY IN *THE FAERIE QUEENE*

In the stability of its architectural framework the Spenserian stanza presents a difficult technical problem, that of maintaining (and regulating the speed of) continuity. Spenser, it is apparent, was acutely conscious of the problem. Professor Tucker Brooke¹

⁶ For the construction of *gewyrca* with the accusative, see Grein-Köhler, p. 842 f

⁷ See Wulfing, *Syntax* II, 503, and Grein-Köhler, on 'von' bei den Verben nehmen, empfangen, p. 526.

¹ "Stanza-Connection in the *Fairy Queen*," *M.L.N.*, XXXVII (1922), 223-27.

has pointed out how frequently he employs the device of repeating or varying, in the first line of a stanza, words and phrases of the preceding alexandrine. But this artifice, though pleasing to the ear, is too transparent for frequent use. Indeed, Spenser apparently tires of it in the later books. Throughout the poem, however, Spenser makes conscious and repeated use of less formal rhetorical devices for transition. The first phrase in the first line of hundreds of stanzas looks back, often awkwardly, to what has just preceded.² These workaday expressions,³ as useful in poetry as in prose, are readily detectable, but they are only the external manifestation of an art which is both elaborate and subtle, an art which employs techniques available only in poetry.

Scores of stanzas are linked together by the musical devices of poetry. In large sections of *The Faerie Queene* a single mood is maintained by repeating the same sounds in a carefully controlled orchestration. Frequently the same rime, with elaborate but well-concealed deliberateness, echoes and re-echoes through successive stanzas.⁴ The most sustained example I have noted is the opening of II, iv, where in the first ten stanzas the rimes are intricately woven together. The first and second stanzas have the same "a" rime. In the second stanza, "b" is the same as "b" of the seventh and "a" of the tenth. The "a" of the third stanza is "b" of the fourth and sixth, "c" of the eighth. The fourth and fifth stanzas have the same "a" rime. "C" of the fifth stanza is the same as "a" of the seventh and tenth. The eighth and tenth stanzas have the same "b" rime.

The rimes that echo and re-echo from one stanza to another help maintain a musical continuity.⁵ But Spenser does not rely on this

² A sustained series, by no means unusual, occurs in VI, xi, 3-16.

³ It has been recently pointed out by V. L. Rubel, *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance* (New York, 1941), p. 254, that Spenser makes "extensive use" of rhetorical figures to link stanzas. The importance of this observation would perhaps be clearer if illustration and analysis had been provided.

⁴ Professor Brooke notes this one non-rhetorical device, but apparently does not think it important. He lists only three examples in which a rime is repeated in a single following stanza.

⁵ I have not tried to draw up an exhaustive list. Here are a few examples taken at random: II, iv, 15-16, 19-20, 29-30, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46; II, v, 22, 23, 25, 26; II, xi, 14-15, 16-18, 24-25, 27-29, 43-44, 46-47; II, xii, 2-4, 33-34, 46-48, 49-50, 54-55, 59-60, 74-76; III, xii, 5-6, 7-8, 19-20, IV, ii, 45-46, IV,

device alone. Rimes are only one kind of structural sound. For instance, frequently even the passage of several intervening stanzas will not prevent a repeated rime from echoing. For Spenser often keeps a sound by repeating it in the unrimed places of a stanza or by approximating it, through assonance, in either rimed or unrimed places.⁶ He can also skilfully link stanzas together by means of alliteration

Sterne was their looke, like wild amazed steares,
 Staring with hollow eies, and stiffe upstanding heares
 Fiersly at first those knights they did assayle,
 And drove them to recoile but, when againe
 They gave fresh charge, their forces gan to fayle,
 Unhable their encounter to sustaine,
 For with such puissaunce and impetuous maine
 Those champions broke on them, that forst them fly,
 Like scattered sheepe, whenas the shepherds swaine
 A lyon and a tigre doth espye,
 With greedy pace forth rushing from the forest nye
 A while they fled, but soone retourned againe
 With greater fury then before was fownd . . .⁷

Because of the strength of its metrical position, the *ff* of "stiffe" has enough vibration to continue being a potentially live sound in the next line. When the corresponsive vibrations meet they gather force, and are able to continue for a longer interval as a live sound.

We come now to Spenser's technique of using rhythm, narrative and metrical, for controlling stanza continuity. The narrative rhythm hardly requires analysis. It is plain enough that the degree of our interest in the story, or in special events, or special embellishments, will help control the tempo of our turning from one stanza to the next. It is amusing, and significant, that Spenser himself

III, 1-2, IV, v, 34-35; IV, vi, 20-21, 22-23, 28-29, 35-37, VI, VII, 29-31, VI, XII, 45-46, 47-50

⁶ For example in II, vi, 14 the "b" rime, "vayn" is the same as the "b" rime of stanza 17. From stanza 11 to 17 the long *a* sound is repeated fifty times (ten times in the combination *am*). And so from stanza 14 to 17 the sound is very much alive, similarly the "b" rime, "take," of 18, which repeats the "a" of 15. Nor does this tell the whole story. For there are *i* and *e* sounds gently interwoven. Furthermore, a delicate net of alliteration closely binds together stanzas 13 and 14, and stretches out, though more loosely, through stanzas 15 and 16.

⁷ II, ix, 13-15. Note that the "b" rime of 14 is the "a" of 15.

should have been affected in the same way. Not all, but most, of Spenser's dull prosaic verse can be found in the first line of any stanza following an exciting passage—one that seemed to move along briskly for both author and reader. An eloquent example is the first line of the stanza following the passage in which "wanton maidens" bathe themselves while Guyon, and the reader, pay close attention—"On which when gazing him the palmer saw"⁸

A line like this—and there are many nearly as bad—illustrates what happens when a break-down occurs in the metrical rhythm of a stanza. Indeed, it is chiefly by examining unsuccessful stanzas that we can begin to understand the importance of metrical rhythm for controlling the balance of each stanza and, through the balance, the continuity. When Spenser is forced to turn away from an attractive subject, when the stanzas of a long dull speech must be patched together,⁹ when dialogue occurs within the stanza¹⁰—we frequently have, not a balanced and indissoluble stanza, but a series of lines.¹¹

But when, as most of the time, the stanza is a perfect whole, we can find many skilful adjustments by which the poet, within the framework of the narrow architectural structure, controls the balance and the tempo. A stanza does not necessarily come to a full

⁸ II, xii, 69. Cf. II, xii, 34; II, ii, 56; I, ix, 52. It is also true that Spenser's effort to link stanzas by rhetorical means causes a large number of bad first lines.

⁹ As II, i, 49-56, ending with the gasping line, "'Which when I, wretch'—Not one word more she sayd."

¹⁰ Spenser likes to begin a stanza with the speech of a character. By doing so he gains the immediate acceleration he consciously, though often awkwardly, cultivates. But he recognizes the limitations of his medium and handles dialogue within the stanza with apparent reluctance, and only after careful uninspired planning—*curiosa infelicitas*. A frequent division is that in which the second voice takes over after the fifth line. Or see the more complex, but wooden, iv, ii, 48.

¹¹ Spenser can also break up the stanza deliberately, for a special purpose—as in the Cave of Care (iv, v, 40-41). In these stanzas the rhythm is jerky, like the nodding head of one dozing off and awaking. The cesura comes after the fourth syllable in practically every line. The rimes come down with a shock, and within the nine lines of the stanza sounds can echo like loud repercussions in a narrow enclosure. It is from an example like this that we can get some insight into Spenser's ability to weld the stanza together. Only deliberately, or when he sleeps, does he let the stanza fall apart.

conclusive stop in the last line. If its balance leans forward, the rhythm will flow, with slight interruption, into the following stanza. The forward impetus can be held back¹² or accelerated by the movement of the thought, the grammatical structures, the use of stress-shifts and runover lines, the weight of the rimes, the combinations of consonants. If the "a" rimes are light, the contrasting weight of the "b" rimes increases the forward impetus of the stanza.¹³ If the final "b" rime (the crucial place of balance for the whole stanza) is heavy, and is not smoothly absorbed into the "c" theme, the forward impetus will be slowed. Usually, when this happens, the final alexandrine, for reasons of stanza balance, will be heavy and conclusive¹⁴. At other times, however, it may be a light rhythmical wave moving swiftly to set in motion the first wave of a new rhythm.

ARNOLD STEIN

University of Minnesota

THE AUTHOR OF "THE ADDRESS" IN QUARLES'S *SHEPHERDS ORACLES*

At the beginning of Francis Quarles's posthumous volume *The Shepherds Oracles* (1646) there is an Address to the Reader which is commonly attributed to Izaak Walton. The attribution, first made by Sir Harris Nicolas in his edition of *The Complete Angler*,

¹² This for instance is done in the stanza that portrays Maleger (II, XI, 22). The rhythm never carries over, but stops at each rime, and the effect is that of the daubing of a brush. The heavy rimes are in keeping with the strong strokes, and both the poetic and pictorial lines are stiff and hard. Spenser maintains a deft control over the nervous qualities of his stanza. When the Red Cross Knight is rescued from the dungeon of Pride, his voice is listless and sick. The verse barely drags itself along limply. The Knight's speech gasps along on monosyllables (I, VIII, 38).

¹³ As in II, IV, 6.

¹⁴ As in III, XII, 20, where the "b" rime is unusually strong, partly because of the rhythm of the stanza, and partly because the rime has been the "b" rime of the preceding stanza. Here is the alexandrine "That dyde in sanguine red her skin all snowy cleene". Notice how the combinations of consonants slow down and weight the line, with the last two words and the strong rime acting as a powerful brake.

1836, (I, xxvi), has passed unchallenged ever since, even the Nonesuch edition of Walton in 1929 included it (pp. 581-2) without questioning its authenticity.

Nicolas argued that as "Quarles had been secretary to Walton's friend Archbishop Usher, and as he was a zealous royalist, and apparently an angler, he was perhaps personally known to Walton." Since both men knew the Marriots, who published the volume, Nicolas continues, "nothing is more probable than that they should have requested him to write the prefatory matter to a posthumous work, which was to appear upon their responsibility. The internal evidence that the Address was written by Walton is so strong, that it will be inserted without the slightest fear of its not being attributed to the real author."

Nicolas's case for the acquaintance of Walton and Quarles is so flimsy that it may be dismissed without comment, and the internal evidence that seemed so strong to him proves on examination to consist of little more than a mention of fishing. The Address concludes

Reader, at this time and place, the Author contracted a friendship with certain single-hearted Shepherds. with whom (as he return'd from his River-recreations) he often rested himselfe, and whilst in the calm evening their flocks fed about them, heard that discourse, which (with the Shepherds names) is presented in these Eglogues.

A friend of the Authors wisht me to tell thee so, this 9 of *Novem* 1645

JO MARRIOT

The last eclogue (xi), in which the shepherds Philarchus, Philorthus, and Anarchus discuss the predicament of the English Church under the attacks of the Root-and-Branch party, written probably in 1643, was published separately at Oxford in June 1644 under the title *The Shepherds Oracle* and appended to the second edition of *The Shepherds Oracles*, the date of the Address to the Reader being changed from 9 of *Novem*. 1645 to 23. of *Novem*. 1645. There were three editions of *The Shepherds Oracles* with title pages dated 1646. While the last eclogue was concerned with recent events, the other ten belong to an earlier decade. They too are discussions of religion between such shepherds as Gallio and Britanus, Arminius and Philamnus, Nullifidius and Pseudo-catholicus; but from references to contemporary events it is possible to

date them all between 1630 and 1633. The death of Gustavus Adolphus in 1632 is the subject of Eclogue x.

It was just at this time that Quarles "contracted a friendship" with Phineas Fletcher, probably through their common patron Edward Benlowes, to whom both the *Emblemes* (1635) and *The Purple Island* (1633) were dedicated.¹ Quarles contributed some commendatory verses to Fletcher's book, and in the *Piscatorie Eglogs and Other Poeticall Miscellanies*, which Fletcher published also in 1633, Quarles appears as Thenot in the elaborate pastoral, or rather, piscatorial convention centering about their connection with Cambridge. As Fletcher was really a "shepherd" in the ecclesiastical sense demanded by *The Shepherds Oracles*, it seems likely that he or one of the "single-hearted" friends he celebrates is the author of the Address to the Reader.

GORDON S. HAIGHT

Yale University

HAMLET, MELANCHOLY, AND THE DEVIL

In explaining his distrust of the Ghost, Hamlet says that perhaps the Devil,

Out of my weakness and my melancholy—
As he is very potent with such spirits—
Abuses me to damn me.¹

This association of the Devil, melancholy, and delusion is based upon psychiatric theories which have long been discarded and forgotten. The present paper is an attempt to sketch the background which once gave meaning to the passage quoted.

One reads in Renaissance works on medicine and psychology that persons in whom the melancholy humor is abnormally abundant are subject to mental aberrations arising from "unico illo humore, uel fuliginoso atrae bilis uapore, mentis sedem inficiente."² Melancholy men "inuent continually some one or other strange imagination" and are prone to develop irrational obsessions "from which

¹ See *The Library*, xvi (September 1935), 188-209.

² *Hamlet*, II, II, 638-40 (Oxford Shakespeare).

³ Johann Wier, *De Praestigijs Daemonum . . . Libri Sex* (Basel, 1568), p. 228.

they cannot [readily] be weined"³ Some even see "bugbears" and talk "with black men, ghosts, goblins, &c"⁴

Because of this mental instability, the Devil finds it easy to delude melancholy men Melancholy is a humor into which "uti aptae suis operationibus materiae non illibenter se insinuare solet daemonium"⁵ It is "the Devil's Bath, and, as *Agrippa* proves," invites demonic visitation⁶ The Devil works primarily upon the imagination, which "he moves . . . by mediation of humours"⁷

Satan's purpose, of course, is to lead his victim to damnation. To do so, he employs various artifices Sometimes he causes the melancholy man to brood over his sins until he develops the obsession that he is doomed to hellfire Thus he commits the sin of distrusting God's mercy Some melancholics, "*diurnae misericordiae diffidentes, se orco destinatos, lamentatione sedulo nocte diuque deplorant.*"⁸ "The principal agent and procurer of [despair] is the Devil," and his ordinary means of provoking it "is the melancholy humour . . . Black choler is . . . a bait to allure" him.⁹ Another stratagem of the Devil's is to produce in the melancholic's mind the impious illusion that he is a prophet of God Melancholy persons troubled "by the intercourse or meddling of euill angels . . . oftentimes . . . foretell & forge very strange things in their imaginations."¹⁰ They believe themselves "inspired by

³ André du Laurens, *A Discourse of the Preservation of the Sight*, tr Richard Surphlet (London, 1599, Shakespeare Association Facsimiles, 1938), p. 96.

⁴ Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed A R Shilleto (London, 1926-27), I, 445 Dover Wilson, in commenting on Hamlet's doubts regarding the Ghost, observes that some sixteenth century authors explain specters as melancholic fancies See his *What Happens in Hamlet* (New York, 1935), pp. 63-64

⁵ Wier, *De Praestigiis*, p. 531 Cf Marsiglio Ficino, *De Vita Libri Tres* (Basel, 1549), p. 20, Cornelius Agrippa, *De Occulta Philosophia Libri Tres* (Cologne, 1533), p. 78, Girolamo Fracastoro, *Opera Omnia* (Venice, 1555), fol. 203r

⁶ Burton, *Anatomy*, I, 493.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 228

⁸ Wier, *De Praestigiis*, pp. 227-28. Cf Jason Pratensis, *De Cerebri Morbis . . . Liber* (Basel, 1549), p. 271, Felix Plater, *Praeaeos* (Basel, 1602), pp. 98-99

⁹ Burton, *Anatomy*, III, 452-53.

¹⁰ Du Laurens, *Discourse*, p. 100.

the Holy Ghost, full of the spirit" ¹¹ According to some authors, Satan commonly entices melancholic old women to renounce God in return for supernatural powers which subsequently they fancy they exercise In other words, he gives them the illusion that they are witches Into their corrupted imaginations he slips "uelut sedem suis studijs accommodatam." ¹²

Satan singles out melancholy persons, then, because they are easy prey Through the medium of their melancholy he is able to cause delusions of various sorts to frighten, to confuse, to induce despair, to provoke crimes such as heresy, blasphemy, renunciation of God It is obvious that the Devil "is very potent with" melancholy men and often abuses them to damn them

LAWRENCE BABB

Michigan State College

THE SOURCE OF THE PRINCIPAL PLOT OF *THE FAIR MAID OF THE INN*

In his introduction to *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, Weber remarked that "The origin of the principal part of the plot . . . is one of the twelve *Novelas Exemplares* of Cervantes, entitled *La Ilustre Fregona*." ¹ Weber's statement is neither true nor well expressed At best, as will be shown, Cervantes' story could have suggested only a few points in one of the sub-plots, or, if one wishes, in one of the complications introduced into the main plot. Seeing in a story, however, "the origin of the principal part of the plot" is perhaps hardly the same as identifying it as the source of the play; yet modern critics have repeatedly reaffirmed and as often denied that *La Ilustre Fregona* was the source of *The Fair Maid of*

¹¹ Burton, *Anatomy*, I, 465. Cf. Wier, *De Praestigis*, p. 228

¹² Wier, *De Praestigis*, p. 16. Wier was the principal proponent of this unorthodox but widely known theory of witchcraft Burton mentions three authors who supported him and eight who attacked him (*Anatomy*, I, 240-41) Reginald Scot's *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584) gave Wier's ideas currency in England DNB. lists seven English writers (including King James) who attacked Scot between 1587 and 1668 and two seventeenth century Englishmen who defended him.

¹ Quoted by Dyce, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher* (London, 1846), x, 4

the Inn, misled in part by Weber and in greater part, perhaps, by the unwarranted assumption that the title-rôle of a play would be prominent in the principal plot.² Professor Schelling, for example, wrote that the play's "source is *La Ilustre Fregona*, which is followed only as to the main plot, and not very closely",³ Macaulay observed that "The plot of the play does not at all resemble the story *La Ilustre Fregona*,"⁴ which, Oliphant added, "has been declared to be the source of the play"⁵ Those who have turned to the novel expecting to find a story similar to that of the play, have found so little that they have perhaps been blinded to what little similarity there is. It is utterly absurd to say that *La Ilustre Fregona* is the source of *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, yet Weber's statement may be accepted if a *minor part* is substituted for "*the principal part* of the plot."

The principal plot of the play is concerned with the feud between Alberto and Baptista, naval commanders and former friends. As appendages to this main plot, there are two love affairs, that of Baptista's son, Mentivole, and Alberto's daughter, Clarissa, and that of Alberto's son, Cesario, and Bianca, the fair maid of the inn, who is discovered to be the daughter of Baptista. The two love affairs are given about equal space, but the part of Clarissa is somewhat larger than that of Bianca, the title-rôle. Clarissa appears in 6 scenes, is given 50 speeches for a total of 162 lines, Bianca appears in 5 scenes, has 36 speeches for a total of 144 lines. That these love affairs are but appendages is shown by the long closing scene of the play. Bianca makes only one speech—a speech of four words, Clarissa delivers two speeches, one of six words and one of thirty lines, but the longer speech is a passionate plea for the restoration of the "ancient friendship" of those

Divided now in passion for a brawl
The makers blush to own

² In the Beaumont and Fletcher plays—as in those of other Elizabethan dramatists—the title-rôle is frequently found in the sub-plot. Cf. *The Little French Lawyer*, *Nice Valour* or *The Passionate Madman*, *The False One*, *The Spanish Curate*, *The Humorous Lieutenant*.

³ F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama* (Boston and New York, [1908]), II, 206.

⁴ *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, VI, 158.

⁵ E. H. C. Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1927), p. 467.

Of the fourteen scenes in the play, no fewer than eight are concerned wholly or in large part with the theme of friendship, feud, and reconciliation. Divested of the love story appendages and of the four scenes in which simple folk are cosened by the pretended conjuror, Forbosco, the play may be summarized as follows

I, I, presents the long friendship of the two comrades in arms, Baptista and Alberto Their sons, Mentivole and Cesario, agree to wager on a race between their horses

I, III Mentivole and Cesario quarrel over the conduct of the race, Cesario having won by fouling Mentivole's horse They fight, Cesario is carried off wounded Baptista, entering, angrily reproves Mentivole for having fought with the son of his old friend and swears that he will have nothing more to do with him until he has sued for and obtained pardon from Alberto

II, I Mentivole, submitting to his father's demands, comes to seek Alberto's pardon, but the older man angrily orders his servants to

"Bind him, and cut off's right hand presently
Fair words shall never satisfy foul deeds
Chop 's hand off "

Before the order is carried out, however, a messenger brings a summons to Alberto to attend the duke immediately He leaves with the final order. "Take away his use of fighting" Cesario, who had previously sought to dissuade his father from depriving Mentivole of his right hand, now fulfills his father's order by merely taking from Mentivole his sword (and a ring given him by Clarissa)

II, III Baptista, informed of Alberto's treatment of Mentivole, vows "I will revenge on the whole family "

II, IV Mariana, wife to Alberto and Cesario's mother, testifies that

"The family of the Baptista
Are grown to faction, and, upon distaste
Of the injury late offer'd in my house,
Have vow'd a most severe and fell revenge
'Gainst all our family."

Cesario, she says,

"shall never
Go forth o' doors, but the contrary faction
Will endanger 's life, and then am I most wretched.
I am thinking of a strange prevention,
Which I shall witness with a bleeding eye."

III, II. The Duke, after noting the outrages, the waste of blood, etc., which have resulted from warring factions both in Rome and in Florence, warns Baptista that

“ the petty brawls and quarrels
 Late urg'd betwixt the Alberti and your family
 Must (yes, and shall), like tender unknit joints,
 Fasten again together of themselves,
 Or, like an angry chirurgeon, we will use
 The roughness of our justice, to cut off
 The stubborn rancour of the limbs offending ”

Mariana now reveals the “ strange prevention ” of which she had spoken in II, iv To protect Cesario against the revenge of the Baptista, she declares him to be no son of Alberto, no son of hers, but a falconer's son whom she had owned as hers because of Alberto's desire for a son

v, 1 Alberto, who had been thought lost at sea, returns to Florence Like Mariana in II, iv, he testifies that many have died in the feud of the two families, although the play throws no further light on the identity of those slain In a review, thought necessary perhaps because of the absence of this plot throughout Act iv, Alberto says

“ at my going to sea,
 Upon a quarrel, and a hurt receiv'd
 From young Mentivole, my rage so far
 O'er-topt my nobler temper, I gave charge
 To have his hand cut off, which since I heard,
 And to my comfort, brave Cesario
 Worthily prevented
 Yet the revenge for this intent of mine
 Hath bred much slaughter in our families ”

v, iii Although the quarrel between Alberto and Baptista, as they meet in the presence of the Duke, reaches a high pitch, the reconciliation of the two families is brought about by the love and betrothal of the son and daughter of one house to the daughter and son of the other.

No suggestion of the friendship-feud-reconciliation theme is to be found either in *La illustre Fregona* or in Caussin's *La cour sainte* or other known stories in which a mother denies her parentage of a son and is by a wise judge, as in *The Fair Maid*, ordered to marry him. Very clearly this friendship-feud plot, which is the principal action of *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, is taken directly from a tradition of the beginning of the famous Neri-Bianchi feud in Florence. The action of the play is, of course, laid in Florence, and that the authors were familiar with the Neri-Bianchi feud is shown by the Duke's referring in III, ii, to

“ the sad example
 At Rome, between the Ursins and the Columnas,
 Nay, here at home, in Florence, 'twixt the Neris
 And the Bianchi ”

The particular account of the feud which was used by the authors of the play, it is doubtless impossible to determine, for they have added and subtracted freely to permit the admission of the two love stories. But one account of the origin of the feud was easily accessible to the dramatists in a small volume ascribed to R. Dallington and printed at London in 1605: "A SURVEY OF THE GREAT DVKES STATE of *Tuscany* In the yeare of our Lord 1596. AT LONDON Printed for *Edward Blount*. 1605." In his brief discussion of Pistoria, Dallington wrote:

This Towne is famous, or rather infamous, for the two factions of the *Bianchi* and *Nerey*, which ruined themselves, and troubled the peace of *Florence* also. It began thus. Two yong Gentlemen of the Towne falling out, and so proceeding from words to blowes, it chanced one of them received a light hurt, The father of the other (because he would kill all motions to a farther quarrell) sends his Sonne to aske a pardon of the Father and Parentage of the other whom he had hurt. but he causing his seruants to lay hold on him, commaunded his right hand to be cut off, and sent him away with this answere: *Va dal tuo Padre & digli, che le ferite non si curano con parole ma col ferro*, Goe to thy father and tell him, hurts are not cured with wordes, but with the sword. Hereupon grew that great and bloudie enmitie betweene those two houses, which drew into it all the great families of *Pistoria*, as also them of *Florence*, where the *Donati* banded with the *Neri*, and the *Curchi*, with the *Bianchi*.⁶

From Dallington or from some similar account of the Neri-Bianchi quarrel the dramatists drew the material for their main plot, the Alberti-Baptisti feud: the quarrel of the two sons, the wounding of one, the father's demanding that his son seek pardon of the victim's father, the father of the wounded man giving orders that the right hand of his son's assailant be cut off, the resulting enmity which caused great slaughter, twice referred to in the play but not presented on the stage. The only change from the old story is in the happy ending of the play—in a reconciliation brought about by the introduction of the two love stories and of the device by which Mariana saves the life of her son Cesario. Here, I think the dramatists may well have used Cervantes' *La ilustre Fregona* and Caussin's *La cour savante*.⁷ Obviously, however, much from

⁶ P. 19. I quote from a microfilm of the copy in the Yale University Library.

⁷ For a discussion of which version of this story was used, Caussin's, Joannes Magnus', or some other, see F. L. Lucas, *The Complete Works of John Webster* (Boston and New York, 1928), iv, 147, and ii, 218-221.

these stories had to be changed and more omitted in fitting them into a background of a family feud. In *La cour sainte* the mother, a widow, denies her son because of the objection to him by one who has promised her marriage, in the play her husband remains alive, and, although somewhat unconvincing, since it was Cesario who really began the quarrel, it was a very happy adaptation to the main plot to have Mariana deny her son in order to protect him from the angry Baptista.

Of *La illustre Fregona*, the dramatists would obviously have to omit much. Cervantes' novel is rather long, and the part of Bianca in the play is subordinate in length even to that of Clarissa. The earlier part of the novel, the wondering disposition of one young man, the decision of his friend to accompany him, their leaving home together, ostensibly to study, their serving together in disguise at an inn far distant from their home—all of this would have been quite incompatible with the main plot which emphasized the depth and bitterness of the family feud. In fitting the story of the novel into that of the play the dramatists have used all that was readily adaptable. In both novel and play the one known as the maid of the inn had been born in the inn at a time when her mother, a rich and high-born lady, separated from the father, was, for the sake of her health, traveling—in the novel to the shrine at Guadaloupe, in the play to the baths at Lucca (a change perhaps dictated by the necessary shift of the scene from Spain to Florence). In each case the girl is brought up as the daughter of the host, attracts by her beauty the attention of a youth of high station, and is in the end married to him when it is revealed that she is of gentle birth, her father the longtime friend of the young man's father.

We may conclude, then, that, although *La illustre Fregona* cannot be, as it has frequently been declared, "the source" of *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, the dramatists may well have borrowed certain situations from it which could be blended into and promote a happy ending to the source of their main plot, the family feud of the Neri and the Bianchi.

BALDWIN MAXWELL

University of Iowa

MATERIALS FOR THE STUDY OF ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA

Authorship and Sources of "Gentleness and Nobility" A Study in Early Tudor Drama, Together with a Text of the Play Based on the Black-Letter Original By KENNETH WALTER CAMERON Raleigh, North Carolina The Thistle Press, 1941 Pp 132 \$2 75 (Text Alone Pp 36 \$75)

John Heywood's "Play of the Wether" A Study in Early Tudor Drama By KENNETH WALTER CAMERON Raleigh, North Carolina The Thistle Press, 1941 Pp 65 \$1 75

The Background of John Heywood's "Witty and Witless" A Study in Early Tudor Drama, Together with a Specialized Bibliography of Heywood Scholarship By KENNETH WALTER CAMERON Raleigh, North Carolina The Thistle Press, 1941 Pp 46 \$1 25

The Wars of Cyrus. An Early Classical Narrative Drama of the Child Actors Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes By JAMES PAUL BRAUNER Urbana The University of Illinois Press (*Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, Vol XXVII, Nos 3-4), 1942 Pp. 163 \$2 50 (Paper bound \$2 00)

The Fairy Knight or Oberon the Second A Manuscript Play Attributed to Thomas Randolph Edited by FREDSON THAYER BOWERS Chapel Hill. The University of North Carolina Press (*University of Virginia Studies*, No 2), 1942 Pp xlii + 87. \$3 00

Pathomachia. An Edition A Dissertation By PAUL EDWARD SMITH. Washington, D C The Catholic University of America Press, 1942 Pp xii + 182

Technogamia By BARTEN HOLYDAY. A Critical Edition A Dissertation by SISTER M JEAN CARMEL CAVANAUGH Washington, D C The Catholic University of America Press, 1942. Pp lxxvii + 253

The Oration in Shakespeare By MILTON BOONE KENNEDY Chapel Hill The University of North Carolina Press, 1942 Pp x + 270 \$3 00

Shakespeare and The Nature of Man By THEODORE SPENCER New York The Macmillan Company, 1942 Pp xii + 233 \$2 75

Climates of Tragedy. By WILLIAM VAN O'CONNOR and MARY ALLEN O'CONNOR Baton Rouge Louisiana State University Press, 1943 Pp xi + 155 \$1.75.

Hamlet The Prince or the Poem? By C S LEWIS *Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy*, 1942. London Humphrey Milford; New York Oxford University Press, n d Pp 18 \$60

The books here brought together for brief survey range for material from the first quarter of the sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth. All treat of the drama, and the majority perform the most welcome of services in making texts available. Several go to the capital of the realm by treating of Shakespeare. In addition to the editorial, survey, and critical tasks which they undertake, most of the authors earnestly try to prove something. Presumably it is part of the duty of the reviewer to tell whether he personally has been convinced.

Mr Cameron's brochures all deal with Tudor interludes by, or claimed for, John Heywood. The discussion of *Gentleness and Nobility*, dated somewhat impressionistically about 1523, begins with a useful analysis of the points of debate in this vital old dialogue, and an interesting discussion of the background of Renaissance thought concerning social distinction and the basis of nobility. Mr Cameron seems so anxious to prove that the sources are "conservative" and that we are not intended to take seriously the subversive views of the radical contestant that he tends to make a fourth in the debate and come to the aid of the Knight and Merchant against the Ploughman. That the latter is a rude and humorous character needs no demonstration, but that the ideas he voices are "sentimental," or satirically intended, seems a view more revealing of the attitude of the commentator than of the author. Mr. Cameron demurs at A. W. Reed's decision that this author is John Rastell, advancing instead the claims of Heywood. His arguments against Rastell's sole authorship are more cogent than those for his own candidate. The possibility is not excluded of some wholly unknown author, or of a collaboration between Rastell and Heywood. Mr. Cameron concludes with apparent caution that "the probabilities are in Heywood's favor," that he is "not an impossible candidate", but he assigns the play to Heywood without qualification in the separately bound text of the dialogue edited from the black-letter original. This useful text appears also as an appendix to the study.

In his essay upon *Witty and Witless* Mr Cameron demonstrates that the dialogue reflects in general the humanistic Christianity of More and Erasmus, and owes specific debts to much of their writing in addition to the frequently cited *Encomium Morae*. Details are traced to numerous works by other writers, most revealingly to Tractatus LXVII of St. Augustine's *Expositio in Evangelium Secundum Johannem*. The date favored for the interlude is c. 1522 when Henry's attack upon Luther, and Luther's reply, would have made the theological language and strongly Catholic tone most timely. An odd qualification accompanies this conjectural date. Mr. Cameron notes that the time of composition must have been subsequent to the entrance of Summers into the service of Henry VIII, an event dated by a modern scholar in 1525. Could not Mr. Cameron have consulted directly with this scholar instead of searching vainly for his authority? In treating *Play of the Weether*, Mr. Cameron convincingly rejects Aesop and endorses Lucian's *Icaromenippus*, with the addition of *Bis Accusatus*, as the source. He dates the play, after a method anticipated by Pollard, probably 1527-28 when a seven year period of destructive rains came to an end:

And well it is knowen to the most foole here
How rayne hath pryced corne within this vii yere,

and certainly after 1525 when King Henry reformed court regulations. Mr. Cameron believes that the play deals partly with conflict of classes, that Henry is represented in Jupiter, and that many allusions in the dialogue illustrate "rich possibilities of historical analogy."

A handsome volume by Mr. James P. Brawner combines what seems to the reviewer to be a completely admirable edition of a play together with a completely misdirected discussion of its date and authorship. Mr. Brawner is so eager to prove that *The Wars of Cyrus* (printed anonymously in 1594) was written by Richard Farrant and performed at Blackfriars about 1576-77 that his long introduction seems prejudiced throughout. It is true that Farrant may have been the author of a song which may have fitted into this play, and that the title page mentions performance by the Chapel, long inactive by 1594, but here any real evidence ends. Mr. Brawner hypothecates an editor of the 1594 text to account for its present state, but this editor, carefully excising traces of antiquity, yet letting the prologue come in after line 600, is quite incredible. So also is the hypothetical setting of the play, with the river Euphrates dividing the camp of Cyrus from the court of Antiochus presumably in the "neo-classical" fashion of the Blackfriars stage. Always confronting us is the play itself, with its latter-day versification and, whether it be technically a conqueror play or not, its post-*Tamburlaine* type of grandiosity. Mr. Brawner explains intrusive details as indicative of the author's "originality," thus offering us a clear choice: Farrant was miraculously original or he did not write the play. We are obliged to accept the lesser wonder, recognizing still Mr. Brawner's care, competence, and success in presenting the text itself.

Mr. Fredson T. Bowers also has a hard case to plead in his introduction to *The Fary Knight*, an amateurish entertainment preserved in a manuscript dating apparently from late in the Commonwealth period. The play, edited in meticulously diplomatic form, is attributed to Thomas Randolph. Since it seems not good enough for Randolph, it is presumed to be *juvenilia*, and since it contains reminiscences from *The Traitor* and other plays written after Randolph's death, it is presumed to have been revised by a reader of Shirley. Why then, we might ask, should it not be Shirley *juvenilia* revised by a reader of Randolph? or the work of some Commonwealth juvenile who had read both Shirley and Randolph? Mr. Bowers finds the Randolph touch most pervasive, and finds hints of an original date about the time his candidate was in Westminster School. It is hard to say. The hints are only hints, and Mr. Bowers is sometimes too easily satisfied with verbal parallels; yet his earnest conviction doggedly presented through introduction and textual notes cannot be ignored: he has at least established a possi-

bility, and enabled us to read for ourselves a hitherto inaccessible play.

The editions of Barten Holyday's *Technogamia* by Sister M. Jean Carmel Cavanaugh, and of the anonymous *Pathomachia* by Mr. Paul E. Smith suggest the meekness of doctoral candidacy in having nothing to prove. Both are creditable specimens of their kind. The plays edited are cruelly dull academic allegories, but they have a significance for the historian of ethics and psychological theory. Mr. Smith's preface, eloquent of the vagaries of early bibliographers, leaves in about its present status the possible claim of Thomas Tomkis to the play. Dr. Cavanaugh provides us with much entertaining material about the performance of *Technogamia* before King James, and the railery showered upon the luckless author. In general, the preparation of this volume has been the more careful and complete of the two. Its one sad defect seems accidental. Either through bad inking or through photographic reduction, the text of the play, printed in offset, is sometimes all but illegible. Those who wonder whether the type of editing sponsored by the Malone Society could not just as well be done by a camera are here given an answer.

Mr. Kennedy's book on the oration in Shakespeare, outgrowth of a succession of studies worked over in a succession of universities, contains good solid stuff. The eighty-three orations of the plays are treated in chapters, usually incorporating tabular charts and parallel quotations, discussing such topics as classification, structure, sources, integration of the passage in the play, etc. The style is sometimes labored, especially in the introductory and quite important survey of classical and later theories of the relation of diction and thought, but elsewhere the author is sufficiently kindled by his subject to indulge in a few tints of those colors of rhetoric which he treats. He is by no means indifferent to the wider reaches of his subject. He finds in Shakespeare the ever-developing, ever-excelling conscious artist, whose dramatic orations, whose "rhetoric in poetic," veered steadily from the example of Seneca to the precept of Aristotle.

The work yet to be noticed in this quite inadequate round-up is primarily critical. Although Mr. Spencer makes no mention of Santayana, his volume seems almost intended to answer the philosopher's disturbing charge that "the cosmos eludes" Shakespeare, in whom we seek in vain "not this or that system but some system," and who portrays life "without a setting and consequently without a meaning." Mr. Spencer begins by describing the philosophical and religious pattern of the universe still available in Shakespeare's day. It was an "optimistic" pattern with neatly articulated hierarchies of Cosmos, State, and Man, with Man's place central, his function clear, his destiny great. After devoting his book to a

discussion of Shakespeare's plays in relation to this cosmological pattern, Mr. Spencer concludes with a fact "previously only hinted"—that Shakespeare transcended conventional concepts and treated "the thing itself underlying codification." Since this "thing itself" is no other than "the individual human life" (precisely Santayana's point), the avowal comes as a surprise because—and only because—the antecedent discussion has had the appearance of giving the plays a cosmic setting. The critic seems to have been concerned with the setting Shakespeare did not give his plays.

Such an impression of Mr. Spencer's work is unsympathetic. Since Shakespeare never troubled to deny the current cosmology, treating it rather as a ruins and quarry, there are metaphors and whole speeches scattered suggestively through his work. But these are debris, possibly no more abundant or significant than debris from the classical pantheon, and Mr. Spencer would not wish to make a book from such details. He believes that there is a genuine correspondence between Shakespeare's dramatic universe and that old formulation, Man, State, Cosmos, and, of course, there is—at least to the extent that in Shakespeare's dramatic universe there are Self, Others, and the Unknown. Mr. Spencer believes also that Shakespeare's consciousness of the impending dissolution of the old formulation in the acid of the new era intensified his sense of tragic conflict—between the ideal and the real, the good appearance and the evil actuality. To the reviewer it seems possible that Mr. Spencer is more saddened by the departing certainties of three hundred years ago than was Shakespeare. Many now seek shelter from the wind who then would have been exhilarated by the fresh air. Mr. Spencer is fond both of Shakespeare and the idea of a patterned universe; he writes about both. If there is an imperfect correspondence between the poet's work and the critic's explication, we should not complain. In most criticism the great irrelevance is the critic. One may say this without impertinence if he adds that critics also are worth knowing—especially when they write so pleasantly as Mr. Spencer.

Mr. O'Conner's book on the climates of tragedy touches the drama of Elizabethan England briefly. He finds the climate then, as in Periclean Greece, propitious, the climate now, unpropitious. Much of the rest of what he finds is divorced from the reader by an excessively abstract style and an excessively solemn tone. One finds himself unwilling to expend the energy required to decide whether a statement like the following has meaning:

Understanding, or if one will, spirit, may be thought of as the moral focus of an individual born of the reaction of the psychic to the "ambient forces" about it.

The book is full of a fierce longing for the fancied austerities of the past.

The Annual Shakespeare Lecture by Mr Lewis reminds us of Goldsmith's opinion that if angels should write books, they would not write folios. His eighteen pages are charming in themselves, yet meet the acid test of writing in this vein by making us reach again for the book. With a disarming pose of guilelessness, Mr Lewis reminds us that *Hamlet* in the hands of the analysts is often not much fun. He suggests surrender to the mood of the poem, a response that is "naive and concrete and archaic." It is a reminder that simple responsiveness to a work of art precedes, both in time and in importance, our competitive interpretations and verbal exercises. To his query, *The Man or the Poem?* we reply, at the moment anyway, *The Poem*—and return to

night, ghosts, a castle, a lobby where a man can walk four hours together, a willow-fringed brook and a sad lady drowned, a graveyard and a terrible cliff above the sea, and amidst all these a pale man in black clothes with his stockings coming down, a dishelled man whose words make us at once think of loneliness and doubt and dread, of waste and dust and emptiness, and from whose hands, or from our own, we feel the richness of heaven and earth and the comfort of human affection slipping away

ALFRED HARBAGE

University of Pennsylvania

REVIEWS

A Short View of Elizabethan Drama, together with some account of its principal playwrights and the conditions under which it was produced. By THOMAS MARC PARROTT and ROBERT HAMILTON BALL. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Pp. v + 311. \$1.80.

"Courtesy" in Shakespeare. By M. M. BHATTACHERJE. With a Foreword by Professor C. J. Sisson and an Introduction by Professor LOUIS CAZAMIAN. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1940. Pp. xix + 225.

Shakespeare's Satire. By OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL. New York. Oxford University Press, 1943. Pp. xii + 227. \$3.75

William Shakespeare's Petty School. By T. W. BALDWIN. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1943. Pp. 240.

Four wartime books, all interesting and all bearing on the subject of Elizabethan drama, are listed above.

The most inclusive of these books is a brief history of Eliza-

bethan drama by Professors Parrott and Ball. It requires years of careful appreciative study to be able to write about Elizabethan drama as these authors do. Particularly noteworthy are the chapters on Marlowe, Heywood, Chapman, Jonson, Massinger, and Brome, the last-mentioned being a belated but just recognition of merit. The chapter on Middleton is hardly a solution of the Middleton mystery, but its plain and scholarly quality gives great satisfaction. The account of Tourneur bestows on him a new unity in character and career, and Marston, at least in tragedy, assumes a new importance. The treatment of Beaumont and Fletcher is not very satisfactory, but with the limited space at the disposal of the authors they could hardly have done better. Beaumont is somewhat doubtfully regarded as the dominating influence. The article on Ford is the least satisfactory of the lot, because it insists on giving too much prominence to the *Astrophel and Stella* story and rather neglects Ford's relation to drama then in vogue at court, however, it is excellent at the end. The discussion of Webster leaves little to be desired, and the authors see no objection to the assignment to him of *Appius and Virginia*. A good deal of space is devoted to summaries of plots, a necessity forced on those who discuss Elizabethan plays for modern readers. Most of these *précis* are extremely well done.

Unfortunately the authors have nothing to say about Shakespeare, who ought to be considered in the book because he is indispensable and because it would have been a matter of great interest to have the opinions of these authors on Shakespeare's relation to the drama of his age. By omitting the first two chapters of the book room might have been found for Shakespeare. These chapters add very little, since it is not possible to treat the earlier drama adequately in such limited space. The effect in these chapters is to give the impression of error. They fail, for example, to show the wide variety of mystery plays (which were not all of the *Corpus Christi* type), to make adequate mention of miracle plays, and to give anything like a true impression of the nature and origin of moralities. They also fail to give proper emphasis to the early romantic drama. These defects are of course only apparent, since the authors did not have at their disposal the space required to treat these subjects in sufficient detail.

Dr. Bhattacharje's book is a simply written, rather factual account of Renaissance courtesy as it affected Shakespeare. The book stresses the importance of courtesy in Elizabethan thought and realizes fully the connection between courtesy and Platonic idealism. Indeed, Dr. Bhattacharje is most at home when Plato comes into consideration. The early chapters on the Chivalric Ideal of Courtesy, Renaissance Courtesy, "Nurture" and Table-Courtesy are discriminating summaries of familiar subjects, and it is in a chapter entitled Renaissance Courtesy in Shakespeare that

the newer study is embodied. Even here there are no great discoveries, but there is a fineness of spirit and a respect for significant detail that speaks well for the author and justifies his book. Castiglione's *Courtier* is a principal source of the author's formative thought, although he shows knowledge of a wide range of writers on his subject.

Professor Campbell's excellently written and brilliantly conceived book does not give entire satisfaction. It is a study of satire in Shakespeare's plays and seeks to prove that a spirit of ridicule came more and more to dominate him. The conceptions arrived at are serious matters in the interpretation of Shakespeare, so that, although admitting gratefully the excellence of the presentation and the entire adequacy of the author's knowledge, this reviewer is disposed to disagree diffidently with some at least of the principal opinions expressed in the book.

The attempt to identify satire in Shakespeare with that of formal satirists like Marston does not seem to be altogether successful. Obvious parallels do exist, but satire was and is a very common thing. There is much of it in Shakespeare, but he uses it dramatically or for ornament and not for itself as Marston does. The author does not deny this of course, but he fails to convince the reader that Shakespeare had much in common with the group of satirists of the day. The chapters on *Love's Labour's Lost*, *As You Like It*, and "Humor" Characters leave room for little but admiration, although there is perhaps too heavy a stress placed on Shakespeare's malcontents. Hamlet is, however, excellently handled, and it is admirably done to see the malcontent in Iago.

Dissatisfaction begins with the author's treatment of *Troilus and Cressida* as a satirical comedy after the dramatic pattern of *Everyman Out of his Humour*. Shakespeare had to tell the story of Troilus and Cressida as it had come down to him. He had no choice, other than misrepresentation, in presenting Cressida, and one cannot believe that he thought of Troilus as an expert in sensuality. It is difficult to regard the story as Shakespeare tells it as told with or for cynical amusement. The resemblance between either this play or *Measure for Measure* and Jonson's play is hard to see. In *Measure for Measure* Shakespeare performed a brilliant task of transforming *Promos and Cassandra* into a comedy. Again he had no choice as to the principal situations. It is doubtful if there is any satirical intention except such as he showed in other places in his description of social depravity. Angelo has the guilt of Promos, and Shakespeare has realized the character imaginatively. Angelo is not a character with whom the audience has sympathy, even after Shakespeare spares him, whereas both the Duke and Isabella are sympathetic. One fails to see why Isabella is not a proper heroine even in her marriage with the Duke, for the Elizabethans showed little sympathy with the ideals of the cloister.

The trouble with *Timon of Athens* is the theme. The old, inflexible story called for an absolute in mysanthropic inactivity. Out of such a situation drama could hardly arise, especially since tragedy can come into being only within a range of action. Perhaps, if Shakespeare left the play incomplete, as he probably did, it was because he had found himself saddled with a story dramatically unworkable. That an atmosphere of derision permeates the early scenes is hard to perceive or that *Timon* is a play in the manner of *Sejanus* or that Shakespeare deliberately seeks to establish in the audience a hostile attitude toward the hero. It still seems better to think that *Timon* was to be honored for his perfect, albeit wasted, generosity.

To the reviewer *Coriolanus* has always seemed to be a noble tragedy. It is incredible that to Shakespeare and his audience *Coriolanus* was a mere victim of rage and folly. Surely Shakespeare did not look at him as an emotional automaton or a puppet or a subject for derision, and to me Menenius is far more suggestive of Enobarbus, or even Kent, than he is of Carlo Buffone. With a simpler interpretation of the interview between *Coriolanus* and his mother, the difficulty of the play tends to disappear. *Coriolanus* finds himself locked in the very jaws of fate, and that his destruction is inevitable. It is no question of a boy's frightened submission to a domineering woman; it is a question of a man's obedience to the primary laws of his being. Man is but blood and bone, the product of generation. He cannot decide against his wife, his son, and particularly his mother, for to do so is to decide against himself.

Professor Baldwin's study of Shakespeare's early schooling comprehends a detailed and original investigation of the Primer and Catechism of the sixteenth-century Church of England. His book outlines the system of religious training employed during the period, particularly during Shakespeare's youth, and shows that the petty school was primarily religious. Particularly detailed is the description of the various forms of Nowell's Catechism and their relation to other catechisms. There is a most interesting chapter on Shakespeare's *Abcedarius* and another of great clarity on Shakespeare's *Writing and Casting Accounts*. Detailed search discovers many hitherto unnoticed recollections by Shakespeare of his petty school and of his religious education. The book ends with an emphatic claim, which seems entirely justified, that the question of Shakespeare's religious affiliation has been put to rest. Shakespeare, the author contends, led a perfectly normal life within the Anglican communion—baptism, marriage, christening of children, burial. Shakespeare was trained to take part in the service of the church and to our knowledge assumed the duties of a godfather—must have taken the sacred vows required for that responsibility.

William Shakespeare, says the author, was an Anglican. The final word, not argued in the book, is to the effect that the motive force of Shakespeare's universe lies in religion, not philosophy.

University of North Carolina

HARDIN CRAIG

The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction A History of Its Criticism and a Guide for Its Study, with an Annotated Check List of 215 Imaginary Voyages from 1700 to 1800 By PHILIP BABCOCK GOVE New York Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xi + 445.

The Making of "Jonathan Wild" A Study in the Literary Method of Henry Fielding By WILLIAM ROBERT IRWIN. New York Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp viii + 156

The First American Novelist? By GUSTAVUS HOWARD MAYNADIER. Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp 79.

Charlotte Smith, Poet and Novelist (1749-1806). By FLORENCE MAY ANNA HILBISH Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania, 1941. Pp ix + 634.

Dr. Gove rightly felt that before a history of the Imaginary Voyage can be written, a bibliographical foundation such as this must be laid, and he has established that basis in a highly competent and serviceable manner. Among the more important works which he includes are *Sindbad the Sailor*, *Robinson Crusoe*, *Gulliver's Travels*, *Prévost's Cleveland*, *Holberg's Niels Klim*, *Candide*, and *Munchausen*. The recorded items are chiefly in English, French, German, and Dutch, but also in five other languages (including a Japanese analogue of *Gulliver*); and the American or British libraries which have been searched are indicated. The factual data are interpreted in the light of an extraordinarily extensive knowledge of the history of the subject. Forgotten or neglected materials are utilized, such as James T. Presley's list of imaginary voyages (1873), and Julius Paludan's *Om Holbergs Niels Klim* (1878),—the latter of interest to students of Swift. Dr. Gove discusses clearly and judiciously the various definitions of the type which have been proposed, and its debatable subdivisions. It is to be hoped that he will bring his learned records down to the twentieth century, and that he will ultimately give us a definitive history of this important genre.

Mr. Irwin's monograph is praiseworthy for its clearness and clean-cut brevity. It expounds the relation of Fielding's ironic

history to the quasi-biographical accounts about Wild, and to the supposed parallels between his career and Walpole's which were commonplaces of political controversy between 1725 and 1742. It discusses the story as a moral parable stressing, as Fielding intended, the contrast between specious greatness and genuine goodness. Finally, it considers the similarities and differences between *Jonathan Wild* and typical criminal biographies, picaresque tales, and comic prose epics.

Dr Irwin's reflections on Fielding's ethics and politics would, in my opinion, have been enriched if he had taken into account Dr. Maria Joesten's *Die Philosophie Fieldings* (the fundamental importance of which was pointed out in *MLN*, XLVIII, 376). Her third chapter, "Das Naturgesetz als Grundlage der Gesellschaftsmoral," deals with *Jonathan Wild*, and shows the coherence between its attitudes and Fielding's general philosophy more thoroughly than Dr Irwin does. Her citations from Locke's *Civil Government* might also have proved useful, as well as her perception that Fielding's ethical and political standpoint was higher than the ordinary contemporaneous outlook.

The First American Novelist contains nothing of value that has not already been set forth in Dr Miriam R. Small's *Charlotte Ramsay Lennox* (1935).

Even the most ravenous appetite for details concerning minor authors should be satisfied by Miss Hilbish's dissertation on Charlotte Smith. Much time and care have been devoted to it, whether deservedly, is perhaps questionable. Over two hundred pages are given to Mrs Smith's doleful biography, which is illustrated with five rather trivial mementoes. The rest of the volume consists chiefly of minute descriptive and analytical accounts of her verses, prose fictions, and books for children. The critical and historical comments, though sympathetic towards Mrs Smith, are sensible and fair-minded. Since the subtle or intricate is absent from Charlotte Smith's writings, her interpreter is not required to possess much discernment or power of expression. Dr. Hilbish's style may be judged by these specimens:

These current fads (the study of botany and natural history) found in her love of nature a ready response, and for a diversion her writing and her own perplexities urged it (p. 217)

The course of incidents, real and probable, are used to impress the reader with sympathy (p. 298)

The Young Philosopher looks back over the past and evolves its causes (p. 299)

Although Mrs. Smith's success as a novelist has eclipsed in modern criticism recognition of her as a writer of children's stories, even in her own day her moral tales for children did not attract such notice or achieve such well deserved popularity as did her novels (p. 475)

No description of nature occurs in many other novels whose rural settings would lead one to suspect such as *Jonathan Wild*, *Clarissa Harlowe*, etc. (p. 528).

Is it captious to declare that universities which allow such English to be published are neglecting their duty?

Some of Dr. Hilbish's data and comments are valuable. Occasionally she corrects the opinions of previous students of the subject. Charlotte Smith's poetry, she maintains, though it is conventionally sentimental in manner, was wholly sincere. Her Gothicism in fiction, except in *The Story of Edouarda*, was not as extreme as commonly asserted. Her purpose in *Desmond*, *The Banished Man*, and *The Young Philosopher* was not primarily to write romances of adventure but to express her political opinions. These opinions vacillated,—but so did those of William Pitt and the rest of the nation. Whatever her faults may be, Charlotte Smith must be credited (this is, I believe, Dr. Hilbish's main contribution) with being one of the first of our novelists to make much of descriptions of nature, and in so doing she was also expressing her true feelings.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare a Survey of the Foundations of the Text. By W. W. GREG. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1942. Pp. lv + 210 \$3.75.

Dr. Greg's new book falls into two distinct parts. The first is a criticism of the principles laid down by McKerrow in his *Prolegomena* for determining the copy-text, i. e. that which the editor selects as the basis of his edition of a play, and for adhering to it. These Dr. Greg redrafts in the form of seven rules. The main issue is the rigidity of the editor's obligation to follow his copy-text when alternative texts of authority are available. McKerrow's attitude was conservative, he would depart from the copy-text only when it is manifestly erroneous. Dr. Greg, though he gags at the words, calls his own attitude eclectic; when variants occur in authoritative texts he would weigh the claims of each variant individually. It is impossible in a brief review even to state the pith of the argument, technical and even abstruse as it is, let alone weigh its merits. I can only say that, while both McKerrow and Dr. Greg have in mind the projected Oxford edition only, every editor of Shakespeare can study the prescriptions they have formulated with the utmost profit.

The second, and longer, part of Dr. Greg's book, originally a series of lectures delivered at Cambridge, is his survey of the foundations of the text. It recapitulates the results of the reevaluation of the original editions of the plays which has been the work of the last thirty-five years. Most of it, therefore, is a more-than-

twice-told tale, Dr. Greg is concerned with verifying and clarifying findings already brought in more than with adding new findings. His lectures are most useful, then, as an up-to-date summary of what we may reasonably assume about the authority of the original editions of Shakespeare and what we should still like to find out and as an index of the most recent progress towards understanding them. I shall try to state briefly the most interesting points which fall under the latter head.

Most important of all, I think, is Dr. Greg's differentiation of author's manuscript and prompt-book and of the kinds of printed text which would be set up from one and the other. He accepts McKerrow's argument that the author's manuscript, the foul papers as he calls it, is the basis of a number of the printed texts and that its stigmata are distinguishable from those of a prompt-book made up by the book-keeper. His position also involves accepting McKerrow's interpretation of erratic speech-prefixes and Professor Gaw's explanation of certain appearances of actors' names in speech-prefixes. It would be most helpful if these conclusions were now accepted as articles of the textual critic's faith. Dr. Greg argues that Shakespeare's foul papers were delivered to the company without invariably being reduced to final form, i. e. that insignificant details were left to be adjusted in the preparation of the prompt-book or during rehearsals. He shows reasons for assuming that the book-keeper might annotate the foul papers as the first step in preparing his prompt-book. In view of the recklessness with which enthusiasts have bandied the word "prompt-book" back and forth, Dr. Greg's discriminating discussion should be made required reading.

Another gain may now be scored, I believe, in Dr. Greg's recognition of a group of mixed texts, as he calls them, i. e. texts printed partly from one kind of copy and partly from another. The air is also cleared of some fairly dense fog by his contention that there are weighty reasons for doubting that most of the folio texts sometimes so described were set up from quartos which had been used as prompt-books. Dr. Greg is less specific than usual in dealing with the editing of the first folio, but his general statements strike me as being more lucid than anything else I can recall on that topic. We need a detailed examination of this important stage in the transmission of the text, hitherto spoken of only in the most glittering generalities.

No brief review can mention even a tithe of the provocative decisions and suggestions which Dr. Greg makes. Speaking generally, since every one expects a book on the text of Shakespeare by Dr. Greg to exhibit unequalled mastery of its materials, I am most impressed by the sanity of his treatment. As evidence I would submit his judicious discussion of ideas which the last generation of scholars have hotly debated, such as the implications of Greene's

taunt, the theory of continuous copy ("a figment of the editorial brain"), Shakespeare's revision of his plays after they were produced, and the theory of assembled texts. I think this book may be taken as standard here is the fullest and fairest statement of our understanding of the texts of Shakespeare at this date, subject to possible qualification only in matters of detail. And it does not close the discussion: it indicates a number of questions which remain to be answered, to which we may now turn our attention.

M. A. SHAABER

University of Pennsylvania

The Complete Poems of John Donne Edited by ROGER E. BENNETT. Chicago: Packard and Company, 1942. Pp. xxix + 306. \$.95.

Mr. Bennett's edition of Donne's poems was prepared avowedly for "those who wish to read Donne's poetry for pleasure." For this purpose, it is admirable, it is compact, well bound and printed, and obvious misprints are few. In order to free the text from all unnecessary difficulties, spelling and punctuation have been skillfully modernized. Textual apparatus has been kept at a minimum. Clearly, the editor's purpose was to render Donne's meaning as immediately apparent as possible, it speaks well for his success that even the experienced reader of Donne gains here a fresh appreciation of the vigor, adroitness, and flow of Donne's ideas.

Those who read chiefly for pleasure are likely to complain only of the omission of an adequate commentary on the poems themselves. In his introduction, Professor Bennett discusses the dating of the poems and certain general aspects of Donne's poetry, but, as he approaches the individual piece, the reader is left to struggle as best he may with Donne's intricacies of thought and his erudition, even though his grasp of an entire chain of ideas may depend upon his understanding a contemporary reference or an archaic phrase. This lack of annotation is the more regrettable because the best source of such help, Grierson's two-volume edition, is seldom readily available to the general reader. Nor would it be entirely satisfactory if it were: sometimes the essential information is not given, and, when it is, it is frequently submerged in a defense of the reading chosen or in a discussion of the sources or analogues of Donne's thought. Thus, even after this latest one, the field is still open for an edition satisfactorily annotated for the person who, though interested, is unfamiliar with the details of seventeenth-century vocabulary and learning. Yet perhaps Mr. Bennett has made the best possible compromise between his purpose and the circumstances under which the edition was published,

for the inclusion of an adequate commentary might have added materially to the volume in both size and cost.

For scholars, likewise, this edition is significant, inasmuch as the text differs from Grierson's in hundreds of readings. In part, this is due to the editor's commendable independence of judgment, and in part to the method adopted for the establishment of the text. Grierson constructed a composite text from the manuscripts and editions available to him, whereas Professor Bennett took as his basis for each poem "whatever accessible text has the fewest obvious errors" and emended it, apparently, only when emendation seemed unavoidable. Though the resulting text is doubtless very close to what some of Donne's contemporary readers accepted, one doubts that the method is so likely as Grierson's to establish *the* text which Donne wrote. By the very nature of the manuscript transmission of the poems, it is unlikely that any one source is wholly free of error, and Bennett's fidelity to his chosen source almost guarantees the retention of some of these early misreadings. Many of the variations from the standard text are trivial, and few make any change in the meaning of the stanza or poem as a whole. Some, however, are significant, and the validity of those few the scholar of Donne will wish to examine closely and determine for himself. In short, though this edition will not supersede Grierson's for scholarly use (a thing which was never intended), no scholar can afford to ignore it.

ROLAND B. BOTTING

The State College of Washington

Milton in the Puritan Revolution By DON M. WOLFE New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1941. Pp. xiv + 496.

This book is not quite what its title implies. It might be called "The Social Reform Thought of Milton, Winstanley, Walwyn, Lilburne and Others." The reviewer continued to hope that the threads were going to be tied together, that the others were to be closely related to Milton in some way. His hope was vain. Mr. Wolfe has given a careful and intelligent analysis of many pamphlets, especially of those on the radical side. He will save many students the trouble of going to the Thomason tracts.

What he has said about the social philosophy of Milton seems to me good. He is somewhat disappointed that Milton, whom he venerates, was not more left-wing. But he has to admire him nevertheless as the first Englishman to speak out for a free press. Other virtues he concedes to him: "Much as Milton despised the ignorance of the masses, it can never be said of him that he did not aspire in his heart for their inhabiting that more ideal world

which he believed possible of realization." Again he says: "Milton is entitled to a place as a democratic reformer because in the course of history the liberties for which he stood have gradually become identified with those reforms demanded and achieved by an increasingly large number of voters." Milton's individualism and his sense of abstract justice "as embodied in the law of nature" appeal to Mr. Wolfe. He emphasizes Milton's conscious attempt to reason consistently from first principles and suggests that he failed less often than a cursory reading of his pamphlets would indicate. Another quotation from Wolfe must be given.

Milton the religious thinker is a striking contradiction to Milton the poet. As a poet Milton was constantly aware of the need of images, of dependence upon traditional poetic devices, of the efficacy of the objective point of view. Master of the classicist art, he thoroughly understood the magic of transporting his reader to the realm of fancy, a realm made real through touch and smell and sound. Scorning tradition and hating ritual, he seems to have held in contempt all effort to create periodically amid the bleakness of daily life a world of mystic beauty and spiritual exaltation. Images he despised as idols. Radical Protestant that he was, religion was to him an ethical code rather than the art of communion through fusion of sense and spirit.

There are many other good passages in this book, there is now and then discernment and even wisdom. Mr. Wolfe's best is very good. He lacks a little the deep familiarity with events and institutions that would have made his work riper. He might say that Masson had dealt with those matters but much has been done since Masson. I wish he had cut the book by a quarter or possibly a third; it is repetitious, wordy, and too crowded with adjectives. There are several misprints. The appendix with various tracts reprinted is useful.

WALLACE NOTESTEIN

Yale University

George Whetstone Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters. By THOMAS C. IZARD. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No. 158. New York. Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. viii + 297. \$3.75.

The opening chapter of this welcome book ably advances our knowledge of Whetstone's life. Though Dr. Izard has failed to determine when Whetstone was born (he favors 1551), where he was educated, and who his wife was, he provides much new information of importance, and he makes it abundantly clear that the previous accounts needed thorough overhauling.

Among other things, he has successfully tackled the problem as to what parts of Whetstone's first publication, *The Rocke of Regard*

(1576), are autobiographical, and he argues that, since Whetstone's dedicatory preface to *The Honorable Reputation of a Souldier* (1585) states that he was without military experience, we must certainly regard as non-autobiographical the first-person references in the earlier work (in the first part of "The Orchard of Repentance") to service in the Low Countries. He concludes that Whetstone began his service there in 1587 and not, as is usually stated, in 1572, and that accordingly he was not at Zutphen. He also throws light on Whetstone's death in 1587 in a duel outside Bergen-op-Zoom with, evidently, the same Captain Udall who had offered to lead Sidney's horse off the field at Zutphen, and who, ironically enough, was accorded praise by Whetstone in the latter's posthumously published elegy on Sidney's death.

But the chief contribution lies in the eight remaining chapters, which take up Whetstone's publications in turn and devote particular attention to their sources and influence. Dr Izard discovers in *The English Myrror* (1586) an unduly neglected possible source of *Tamburlaine*, and in his thoroughgoing treatment of the much discussed relation to *Measure for Measure* of Whetstone's ten-act *Promos and Cassandra* (1578) and his prose tale of the same story in *An Heptameron of Civill Discourses* (1582) he concludes that Shakespeare was indebted to the latter as well as to the former version. The well-rounded chapter on *Promos and Cassandra* ends with calling attention to the anticipation of Jonson in the emphasis its dedicatory epistle places on the necessity for verisimilitude and fidelity. A passage in this epistle also appears to have been the source of a famous passage in Sidney's *Apology*.

The volume is well organized and, despite the presence of some naive truisms and of occasionally infelicitous efforts to add vivacity to the discussion, well written. Dr. Izard is also to be commended for his judicious criticism of Whetstone's literary method and his sane estimate of Whetstone's achievement. At no time, I think, is he inclined to exaggerate either Whetstone's importance or ability, or, for that matter, to follow George Steevens in unduly belittling him.

The book has, however, several shortcomings. The appended bibliography of Whetstone's works is useful but unscholarly, relying as it so often does on modern reprints. But this, together with a failure to examine certain *inquisitiones post mortem* and other papers at the Public Record Office and elsewhere, can be attributed to the War. What is less easy to explain is the absence of a general bibliography and the frequently inadequate documentation of facts and inferences bordering on the major subject. It is a pity, too, that so much of the information about Gascoigne is derived from the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and Captain B. M. Ward's articles instead of from C. T. Prouty, whose long-prepared book on

Gascoigne shortly preceded this volume from the same press. Indeed, both of these coincident studies might have profited from each other.

J. A. GEE

Yale University

A Study of the Novels of John Galt. By FRANK HALLAM LYELL.

Princeton Princeton University Press, 1942. Pp x + 237.
\$2.50.

Professor Lyell's critical study of John Galt, following Jennie Aberdeen's recent biography, reminds us of a gifted Scottish novelist who deserves to be more widely known. Unfortunately it does little more. Professor Lyell discusses the novels chronologically as independent units, with few references to the history and technique of English fiction or to the developing themes of Scottish vernacular literature. Such a method inevitably gives the impression of scrappiness. There is a good deal of plot summary and much quoting from early critical notices, with only occasionally a sharp glance from a fresh point of view. But many of Galt's lesser known works are for the first time described at length, and perhaps it is in its inclusiveness that much of the value of this book is to be found.

It may be ungracious to quarrel with the author over the amount of attention devoted to analysis of the work (both fiction and non-fiction) of Galt's apprentice and senile years, but surely 5000 words on *The Majolo* and *The Earthquake*, without serious doubt two of the worst novels ever written, argue a curious lack of discrimination,—especially since *Glenfell*, Galt's first published Scottish novel, is dismissed in a paragraph. With the more important novels Professor Lyell usually notes the circumstances of composition, traces the narrative at length, with emphasis on Galt's "prime bits," comments on plot and character, and follows the course of the work's reputation. All this is unexceptionable, and there is no reason to wish that it ever be done again.

In his bibliographies Professor Lyell is particularly vulnerable to criticism. His list of Galt's works omits more than a score of stories and articles for periodicals, all of which were available in an earlier bibliography which he mentions by title. Further, his bibliography of early reviews and critical notices is extremely faulty. He lists, for example, only one review of *Lawrie Todd*; there were at least seven; one of *Bogle Corbet*; there were at least six; four of *The Life of Byron*; there were at least thirteen. In addition, there is no reference to the many critical notices in American periodicals. These omissions, though perhaps of no great consequence in themselves, lead one to suspect that principles

of thoroughness and accuracy have not always guided the author elsewhere

BRADFORD A. BOOTH

*University of California
at Los Angeles*

Gray as a Literary Critic. By HERBERT W. STARR Philadelphia
University of Pennsylvania, 1941. Pp. vi + 144. Dissertation

Most of us who have read his letters believe that Thomas Gray could have been the best literary critic of his day, perhaps not so interesting as Doctor Johnson but more often correct. But the fact remains that he was not, at least to the literary world of his time, a critic at all, and to strain the evidence to the breaking point, as Mr. Starr has been forced to do, is merely to emphasize again Gray's failure to live up to his talents.

By far the best of Gray's criticism is to be found in his letters, and this is easily accessible in the Toynbee-Whibley edition. By following the references in Whibley's excellent topical index, one can in a moment find whether Gray has anything to say on a given subject. The only other source of Gray's own critical writing is in his notebooks, especially the three-volume Commonplace Book at Pembroke College, Cambridge. In these notebooks only a few nuggets of criticism lie buried in hundreds of pages of scholarly dust. Of this little the best was first printed by T. J. Mathias in 1814 and copied, mistakes and all, by Edmund Gosse in the edition Mr. Starr uses. The few specks that were left have been published recently in Roger Martin's *Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de Thomas Gray* and in my *Thomas Gray, Scholar*.

With such slender evidence and little likelihood of any more turning up, Mr. Starr could probably not have made a very substantial book, even if he had consulted manuscript sources. He has arranged his meager evidence carefully, and, like Mason before him, he has let Gray speak for himself, so much so that the quotations from Gray and his contemporaries will furnish convenient illustrative material for the college lecturer. The most original contribution of the book is the comparison of Gray's critical ideas with the thought of his time, from which Mr. Starr concludes (p. 131): "In no truly important aspect does he lag behind the contemporary pioneers in criticism, and—comparatively speaking—he avoids almost all of the more dangerous pitfalls into which the best of his fellows tumbled."

My quarrel, if any, is not with Mr. Starr, for he has accomplished the small task he set out to do and, in doing so, has served his apprenticeship for the doctorate. It is rather with the requirement that such dissertations be published, usually at great expense

to the author. Even that should not have prevented Mr. Starr from adding the index that is essential in any scholarly work.

W. POWELL JONES

Washington, D. C.

Survivals in Old Norwegian of Medieval English, French and German Literature, together with the Latin Versions of the Heroic Legend of Walter of Aquitaine. Translated by H. M. SMYSER and F. P. MAGOUN, Jr. Baltimore: Waverly Press, Inc., 1941. Connecticut College Monograph no. 1. Pp. xi + 163. \$1.75.

The book of Professors Magoun and Smyser is the first of the Connecticut College Monograph series. The institution is to be congratulated on having opened this series with a book that is extremely useful for the student of medieval literature as it gives him for the first time easy access to important Norwegian and Medieval Latin texts in an English translation that tries to "preserve the wording of the originals."

The selections chosen for translation from Norwegian into English are from the *Karlamagnús saga ok Kappa hans* "The Story of Landres" and "William Short Nose" (done by Prof. Smyser), from the Breton Lays "The Lay of Gurun," "The Lay of the Beach of Barfleur" and "Ricard the Old" (done by Professor Magoun), the English or French originals of which are no more extant, and from the *Thiðrek's Saga* four portions (done by Prof. Magoun) which are important for their connection with other literary documents, the "Story of the Niflungs" with the Middle High German *Nibelungenlied*, "Wayland the Smith" with the Old English *Déor* and the Eddic *Volundarkviða* and "Walter and Hildegund" with other versions of the legend of Walter of Aquitaine and "Hildebrand and Alebrand" with the *Hildebrandslied*.

In Part II Professor Magoun translates three Medieval Latin texts, two of which, the "Poem of Walter" (*Waltharii Poesis*) and "Walter the Strong, Count of Tyniec," are related in subject-matter to "Walter and Hildegund" of Part I, whereas the third text "Walter, Monk of Novalesa" (*Waltarius Monachus Novaliensis*) is of importance only insofar as "students of the legend have reckoned with it persistently."

The authors have well succeeded in providing in the introduction, in the head-notes and in the index brief, yet very valuable information about sources, research, names and sites etc.

The book is a fine tribute of Professors Magoun and Smyser to their late friend, Dr. F. Stanton Cawley.

F. MEZGER

Bryn Mawr College

BRIEF MENTION

The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes. By LOUIS C. JONES New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 259. \$2 75 Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 157. This book is a well organized and carefully documented account of the subject it professes to treat. One looks in vain for the usual titillations which most people seem still to expect and often get when they read books on this aspect of eighteenth century life. The author has evidently given his varied source material genuine critical consideration, he has a style that walks forward fearlessly and a sense of humor that refuses to regard anything human as alien. He manages to present his facts, his anecdotes, and his characters with a very welcome freshness, often relating the freakishness of much that went on in these Hell-fire clubs, the horrors of their profanities that so shocked contemporaries, their obscenities that marked sometimes lack of character but often lack of good taste, to the whole picture of manners and morals of the time and leaving us with a sense of balance not often achieved in books of this kind. Some may feel that the curve of rakishness which gives the book its form, from the tradition of the Scourers and Mohocks through the grand climacteric of Medmenham to the last expiring none-too-decorous gasps of clubs that had lived long into the unsympathetic nineteenth century, is somewhat too rigidly insisted on. Riding the goat, or watching others do it, and the group worship of Venus and Bacchus are at all times fairly popular, but the Medmenham goat (or was it a baboon?) had very special markings, as had the wig that Lord Moray stole from the Beggar's Benison, and Mr. Jones has a perfect right to ask us to observe these as they become more and more clearly visible and then gradually blurred out. Students of literary history will find many familiar names here; they will perhaps be particularly interested in the account of Sterne and the Demoniacs, and in the scattered verses of the clubs, some of which remind one of the looser efforts of the earlier Scriblerus.

Duke University

W. H. IRVING

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

MARCH, 1944

Number 3

ZUM PROBLEM DER NOVELLE BEI KLEIST

Die Bemühungen um die Form der Novelle in deutscher Sprache reichen bis nahe an die Anfänge der modernen Literaturepoche zurück. Experimentell und theoretisch haben deutsche Dichter sich mit ihr seit mehr als 150 Jahren auseinandergesetzt, aber nur in vereinzelten Fällen und dann bemahe zufällig haben sie die Anforderungen der Novelle auf ihre Weise und in ihrem Geiste erfüllt.

Die Novelle als Kunstform ist dem Deutschen wesensmassig fremd. Weder in dem Leicht-fließenden der romanischen "novella," noch in dem Pointierten der englischen "short-story" fühlt er sich zu hause. Er begnügt sich nicht gerne mit den Erscheinungsformen des Daseins, sondern verlangt von der Dichtung, dass sie hinter die Erscheinung vorstosse—und dieser Vorstoss ist notwendig der Todesstoss der Novelle.

Die Geschichte der Novelle in Deutschland ist daher vor allem eine Geschichte von Theorien und Experimenten. Dem deutschen Dichter ist die Novelle—mit ganz wenigen Ausnahmen—Problem geblieben, eine abgeleitete und immer wieder von neuem abzuleitende Kunstform. Vielleicht nur bei Goethe, Kleist, Keller und Storm wuchs sie organisch aus dem Gehalt und dem Wesen des zugrunde liegenden Erlebnisses, sei es biographischer oder ästhetischer Natur. So gibt es zwar eine Geschichte der deutschen Novelle, aber keine wirkliche deutsche Novellentradition.

Daher mag es kommen, dass das, was die deutsche Literatur an Novellen vorzuweisen hat, nie oder nur selten ubernationale Würdigung gefunden hat. Selbst innerhalb der deutschen Literaturkritik ist das Misstrauen gegen die Novelle—und nicht nur gegen die Novelle sondern gegen jede Prosaform—weitverbreitet. Sogar dort, wo wirklich einzigartige prosaische Kunstgebilde vorliegen, besteht

eine Neigung sie zu diskreditieren und ihnen die Lyrik und vor allem das Drama als vollgültigere Formen vorzuziehen. Grillparzers Novellen standen so sehr im Schatten seiner Dramen, dass eine spätere Generation sie neu zu entdecken hatte. Nicht einmal Epiker wie Freytag und Storm haben sich von dieser Faszination durch das Drama freimachen können.¹

Kleists Novellen machen darin keine Ausnahme. Auch in seinem Werk haben die Dramen die Novellen überschattet. Die weitverbreitete Tendenz, schreibt Hermann Davidts, in der dramatischen Dichtung eine künstlerisch wertvollere Ausdrucksform zu erblicken als in der epischen Prosadichtung, hat auch hier Schaden gestiftet.²

Wie weit sind die Gründe dafür in Kleists Novellen selbst zu suchen? Es ist verständlich, dass eine Kritik, die im Drama eine vollkommenere Form sieht als in der Prosa, die Novellen von den Dramen aus zu deuten und zu werten versucht. Kleists Werk musste dazu besonders einladen. Dass die Beziehungen zwischen dramatischer und epischer Kunstform bei ihm sehr eng sind, kann natürlich nicht geleugnet werden. Eine gewisse innere Bedingtheit der frühen Novellen durch dramatische Formprinzipien ist unverkennbar. Aber Davidts Hypothese, dass Kleists Entwicklung vom Drama zum Epos fortgeschritten sei, und dass seine Novellen das Mittelstück eines unterbrochenen Werdeganges darstellen, ist eine ungeheuerliche Verallgemeinerung, die noch dazu mit Davidts eigenen Ergebnissen nicht zusammenstimmt. Es ist sehr gewagt, bei Kleist von einer inneren Entwicklung zu sprechen. Auf jeden Fall lässt sich die Chronologie der Novellen nicht einfach durch den Grad ihrer Abhängigkeit von dramatischen Urformen bestimmen. Die Novellen, die am meisten einem dramatischen Aufbau nahekommen, sind *Die Verlobung von St. Domingo* und *Die Marquise von O . . .*, von denen die erstere ein Frühwerk ist und die letztere einige Jahre vor Kleists Tod geschrieben wurde. Das Entscheidende bleibt, dass die Novellen, und selbst die frühesten,

¹ Gustav Freytag. "Der Aufbau der Handlung wird in jedem Roman, in welchem der Stoff künstlerisch durchgearbeitet ist, mit dem Bau des Dramas grosse Ähnlichkeit haben." *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*, 1887, S. 261.—Zu Storm vergl. seinen Brief an Keller in Köster's Ausgabe, S. 119 ff.—Selbst bei Jean Paul finden sich ähnliche Tendenzen; vergl. seine *Vorschule der Ästhetik*, § 70 und 71.

² Hermann Davidts, *Die novellistische Kunst Heinrich von Kleists*. Bonner Forschungen, Neue Folge, No. 5, Berlin 1913. (S. 7)

in sich geschlossen, selbständig und einmalig sind, und man ihnen ihre eigene dichterische Existenz nicht absprechen kann.

Ein Vergleich der Novellen mit den Dramen kann daher nur dann fruchtbar sein, wenn man das beiden Gemeinsame, den dichterischen Schaffensprozess in all seiner Mannigfaltigkeit, aufzuzeigen versucht, nicht aber solange in den Dramen nach Aufschlüssen und Quellen für die Novellen gesucht wird. Das was die Novellen mit den Dramen verbindet, ist nicht das Formale sondern das Temperament, der Lebensatem des Dichters. Als Gattungen sind sie zugleich objektiv und subjektiv—subjektiv in ihrer menschlichen Fundamentierung und objektiv in ihrer erzählerischen Kristallisation des Problems. Aber das ist bei den Dramen nicht anders. Es lässt sich kaum ein dichterisches Werk denken, bei dem die Begriffe "subjektiv" und "objektiv" so wenig besagen wie bei Kleist. Jeder Leser spürt unmittelbar das Persönliche und Intime, er glaubt in das Innerste und Privateste seines Lebens und Denkens zu schauen, und doch lässt sich aus seinen Dichtungen wenig Tatsächliches über den Menschen Kleist ablesen. Kleist enthüllt und verhüllt sich in gleichem Masse. Seine Dichtung war in jedem Augenblick Ausdruck und Auswuchs eines tiefen Dranges, eines Verlangens nach gestalteter Lauterung, nach Welterschöpfung, und als solches strebte sie ins Sichtbare, Objektive. Die verschiedenen Ausdrucksformen, wie Drama, Lyrik und Novelle, sind nur verschiedene Wege zu demselben Ziel, Konturlinien um dasselbe Zentrum. Selbst die Gelegenheitsdichtung steht nicht ausserhalb dieses geistigen Bannkreises.

Die Novellen sind deswegen den Dramen verwandt, aber sie sind keineswegs einfach Dramen in Prosaform. Es gilt hier sehr vorsichtig zu unterscheiden. Sie sind nicht dramatisch—oder sie müssen es jedenfalls nicht sein—aber sie sind tragisch. Es gibt in ihnen weniger Momente humoristischer Befreiung als in den Dramen, und der Humor führt nirgendwo zu einer Erlösung wie im *Zerbrochenen Krug*. Während der Dramatiker Kleist lachen kann, bringt es der Novellist nur zum Lächeln, einem mitleidigen Lächeln in der *Heiligen Cécile*, einem boshaften Lächeln in der *Marquise von O. . .*

In Kleists Dichtung sucht man vergeblich nach Ruhepunkten. Nicht jedes Werk steht unter demselben atmosphärischen Druck, die seelische Intensität wechselt oft von Akt zu Akt und von

Kapitel zu Kapitel, aber eine wirklich unbeschwerte Stille findet sich nirgendwo. In den dramatischen oder novellistischen Ablauf sind Momente der Beruhigung und des Nachlassens verwoben, aber nur als Antithesen des Gefühls, als die Tiefpunkte des seelischen Auf- und-Abs, als Augenblicke notwendiger Sammlung Volliges Vergessen bleibt unmöglich. Für das Idyll, unabhängig vom Schicksal und rein in sich beruhend, beschaulich oder resignierend, lebensfroh oder lebensmüde, gab es in Kleists Dichtung keinen Platz.

Trotz all dieser Beziehungen zum Drama stehen die Novellen als etwas Besonderes da. Dieses Eigene lässt sich nur an Hand ausführlicher Einzelanalysen aufzeigen, die den Rahmen der vorliegenden Arbeit durchaus sprengen würden. Einige allgemeinere Überlegungen müssen statt dessen genügen.

Schon Gundolf³ hat darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass Kleist in seinen Dramen vom Menschen, in den Novellen aber vom Geschehnis ausgegangen sei, dass die Dramen von innen nach aussen, die Novellen aber von aussen nach innen fortschritten. Diese Scheidung ist zutreffend, aber sie reicht nicht aus, die Prosaform eindeutig von der Dramaform abzuheben. Sie genügt nicht, das Phaenomen der Novelle bei Kleist zu erklären. Es gibt unter den Novellen einige, die mehr sind als die Abwicklung eines Geschehnisses, in dem die Menschen sich nur als agierende Figuren bewegen. Und auf der anderen Seite leitet sich auch im Drama der Konflikt nicht immer rein aus dem Seelischen ab. Antonio Piachi (im *Findling*) steht unter einer ähnlichen Verknüpfung von Ereignissen wie die Familie Schrockenstein. Die Vorgänge und Vorfälle, die die Figuren im *Zweikampf* in ihre tragischen Verwicklungen stürzen, sind nicht "ausserlicher" als die Geschehnisse, die sich im *Zerbrochenen Krug* komisch abwickeln.

Ebenso wenig hilft uns Gundolfs Scheidung von "gemussten" und "gekonnten" Werken Kleists. Dass Kleist sich nicht in jedem seiner Werke mit gleicher Intensität gegeben hat, dass sein Wissen um künstlerische—dramatische wie epische—Technik sich nicht immer im selben Masse der Intuition bediente, lässt sich nicht abstreiten. Es mag sogar sein, dass die Novellen—wie Gundolf meint—ausschliesslich ein Produkt des Könnens und nicht des

³ Friedrich Gundolf, *Heinrich von Kleist*, Berlin 1924 (besonders das Kapitel "Erzählungen," SS 152 ff.).

Mussens gewesen sind. Aber das wurde sie, als Kunstwerke, durchaus nicht von den Dramen abheben und sie etwa zu Dichtungen zweiten Ranges herabsetzen. Auch der *Zerbrochene Krug* und der *Amphitryon* verdanken ihr Entstehen ja weithin diesem artistischen Konnen. Überhaupt scheint es sehr fraglich, ob man das Konnen als solches dem Mussen unbedingt unterordnen darf. Das Vorurteil gegen das Handwerkliche ist ein sehr deutsches Vorurteil. Wo finde denn im *Kathchen von Heilbronn*—um nur bei Kleist zu bleiben—das Mussen an und wo horte das Konnen auf? Und wer wollte uns sagen, ob das Konnen, dem der *Zerbrochene Krug* zu einem guten Teil seine Existenz verdankt, nicht nur eine Erscheinungsform des Mussens war?

Die Bedeutung der Novelle als Form—und damit der Unterschied zwischen Drama und Novelle—muss sich aus dem Formalen und dem Gehaltlichen zugleich ableiten lassen, wenn er uns überhaupt greifbar werden soll.

Ganz allgemein lässt sich zunächst folgende Feststellung machen: während die Stoffe der Novellen für eine dramatische Bearbeitung ungeeignet waren, ungeeignet aus mannigfaltigen Gründen, lagen sie ihm, dem Dramatiker, doch so sehr am Herzen, dass er den Umweg ins Epische nicht scheute, solange er darin sein Eigenstes geben konnte. Die von ihm zu verwendende Prosaform hatte seinem dramatischen Temperament zu entsprechen. Er wählte die Novelle als eine Form, die mehr und andere Möglichkeiten bot als das Drama, wenn sie auch ihrem Aufbau nach dem Drama relativ verwandt war. Soweit man von einer Entwicklung in seinem Werk reden kann, scheint Kleist sich dieser Möglichkeiten in steigendem Masse bewusst geworden zu sein, obgleich er damit keineswegs eindeutig von der dramatischen Struktur fortstrebte. Er war von Anfang an Erzähler genug, seinen novellistischen Stoffen ungehindertes Wachstum zu gönnen.

Im Stofflichen unterscheiden sich die Novellen dabei zunächst weniger durch ihr verschiedenes spezifisches Gewicht als durch ein recht ausserliches Faktum, das sich als praktische Verwendbarkeit bezeichnen liesse. Denn dass die Novellen nur zufällige und abwegige Einzelstoffe behandelten, die sich beliebig von Kleist hatten vermehren lassen—mit anderen Worten. "Berichte über ungeheuerliche Einzelfälle" waren (Gundolf), die an der Peripherie des Menschlichen lägen, kann nicht deutlich genug zurück-

gewiesen werden. Die gewählten Motive sind auch hier Erscheinungsformen des grossen Komplexes von Tod und Leben, Hass und Liebe, Humanität und Humanitätslosigkeit. Was sich in St. Domingo abspielt, ist nicht abwegiger als die Tragödie Penthesileas. Das Erdbeben, das die Menschenschicksale in scheinbar sinnloser Weise durcheinander wirft, macht das *Erdbeben von Chih* weder zu einer "Schauer-" noch zu einer "Wundergeschichte" (Gundolf), sondern stellt ganz elementar die befreiende und zugleich vernichtende Gewalt der Natur dar.

So viel wird jedenfalls deutlich: die Wahl der Novellenform ist bei Kleist nicht durch den grosseren subjektiven Gehalt des Stoffes bestimmt, wie dies etwa bei Grillparzer der Fall ist. Nicht das Ich des Dichters hat die Scheidelinien zwischen Drama und Prosa gezogen, sondern das Wissen des Dichters um das Gesetz der Form, um die dem Stoffe innewohnende Ausdrucksmöglichkeit.

Ein Vergleich der dramatischen Qualitäten der verschiedenen Novellen und ihrer Stoffe kann uns noch einen Schritt näher an das Zentrum des Problems heranführen. Schon Max Lederer⁴ ist in seiner Arbeit über die Dramatiker-Erzählung auf diese Weise zu wichtigen Ergebnissen gekommen, die sich in einigen Punkten mit denen Davids' decken. Lederer hat seine Masstäbe wesentlich aus einer ausführlichen Untersuchung der *Marquise von O . . .* gewonnen. Seine Unterscheidung von dramatischen und epischen (Davids' fatalistischen und charakterologischen) Dramatiker-Erzählungen, die eigentliche Aufgabe seiner Arbeit, lässt sich sicher nicht in jedem Einzelfalle halten, aber soweit es sich nur um Kleist handelt, gibt sie einen guten Ausgangspunkt ab. Zur Gruppe der dramatischen Novellen Kleists rechnet er lediglich *Die Marquise von O . . .* und die *Verlobung von St. Domingo*, während er den *Findling*, die *Heilige Cacilie* und das *Erdbeben von Chih* als epische Dramatiker-Erzählungen bezeichnet. Abgesehen davon, dass er den *Michael Kohlhaas*, das *Bettelweib von Locarno* und den *Zweikampf* ohne weitere Begründung übergibt (und dies ist nicht die einzige und wichtigste Auslassung in seiner Arbeit!), können wir uns mit Lederer einverstanden erklären.

Die grossere Nähe der *Marquise von O . . .* und der *Verlobung von St. Domingo* zur dramatischen Form liegt auf der Hand und

⁴ Max Lederer, Die Novelle des Dramatikers, *Neophilologus*, 5. Jahrgang, 1920, SS. 315-333.

ist, was die *Marquise von O . .* betrifft, durch Ferdinand Bruckners Dramatisierung praktisch bewiesen worden. Aber auch die *Verlobung von St. Domingo* liesse sich in einem dramatischen Gefüge sehr wohl denken. Davidts weist darauf hin, dass diese Novelle sich "von allen anderen Novellen durch eine streng durchgeführte szenische Gliederung" auszeichne. Die Darstellung der Katastrophe wurde allerdings ungleich grossere Anforderungen an den Bearbeiter stellen als die *Marquise von O . . .* Rein technisch gesehen unterscheiden sich diese beiden Novellen von den anderen dadurch, dass in ihnen die dramatische Einheit des Raumes bewahrt bleibt oder sich doch leicht in einer dramatischen Umformung erreichen liesse. Das *Erdbeben von Chili*, das sich ebenfalls auf engstem Raume abspielt, ist dagegen aus dem Grunde als Dramenstoff unverwendbar, weil der Konflikt sich nicht zwischen einander entgegengesetzten Menschengruppen abspielt, sondern den Menschen in blindem Gegensatz zur absoluten Natur zeigt—oder anders gesagt, weil die Natur in tragender Rolle in die dramatisch-epischen Vorgänge eingefügt ist.

Lederer weist nun daraufhin, dass in der *Marquise von O . . .* der "heikle Gegenstand" einerseits und andererseits die Tatsache, dass "weniger die Charaktere als vielmehr die Ereignisse den Gegenstand der Handlung bilden," die dramatische Bearbeitung des Stoffes ausgeschlossen habe. Sein Argument unterscheidet sich von dem Gundolfs darin, dass für ihn das Gegenständliche nicht ein untergeordnetes Element bedeutet.

Dasselbe liesse sich auch von der *Verlobung von St. Domingo* sagen, nur dass hier das "Heikle" nicht darin besteht, dass der Dichter sich mit einer gewissen Ironie über das Tabu bürgerlicher Moralbegriffe hinwegsetzt, sondern in dem rein erotischen Charakter des dramatisch-epischen Konfliktes liegt. Dass der Konflikt mehr in die Ereignisse als in die Charaktere verlegt scheint, kann aber nicht als prinzipieller Einwand gegen die dramatische Natur des Stoffes genommen werden. Die Betonung des Stofflichen ist zum Teil durch die erzählende Darstellung selbst bedingt. Es handelt sich bei Kleist ja eigentlich nie um die Gestaltung des Menschen, sondern um das Sichtbarmachen der Kraft, die ihn bewegt. Während im Drama der Mensch der unmittelbare Träger dieser Kraft ist und als solcher deutlicher in den Vordergrund tritt, ist dem Novellisten dieser Umweg in die Charakterisierung zu

einem guten Masse erspart. Eine dramatische Gestaltung der beiden genannten Novellen wurde den Konflikt in die Charaktere verlegen und aus ihnen ableiten. Auf der anderen Seite lassen sich die Ereignisse, die dem *Zerbrochenen Krug* oder dem *Kathchen von Heilbronn* zu Grunde liegen, ganz gewiss in einer novellistischen Bearbeitung denken, was, im Falle des *Zerbrochenen Krugs*, die Novelle Zschokkes beweist.

Es bleibt uns daher als Antwort auf unsere Frage nach dem Warum der dramatischen Novellen Kleists nur das, was Lederer als das "Heikle" des Gegenstandes bezeichnet hat Heikel—wenngleich in einem subjektiveren Sinne—sind aber auch z. B. die den Grillparzerschen Novellen zugrunde liegenden Motive. Doch während das, was bei Grillparzer nicht in die objektiv sichtbare Form des Dramas gekleidet werden konnte, dem intimen Erlebnissbereich des Dichters angehörte, handelt es sich bei Kleist um intime Erlebnismöglichkeiten des Menschen überhaupt. Selbst eine Novelle wie die *Verlobung von St Domingo*, in der man eine "private Dichtung im höchsten Sinne des Wortes" (Davidts) gesehen hat, hat sich doch von ihrem Dichter in einem ganz anderen Grade objektiviert als eine der beiden Novellen Grillparzers.

In den "epischen" Novellen Kleists hat das Stoffliche allerdings eine dramatische Gestaltung von vornherein ausgeschlossen. Vielleicht konnte man im *Bettelwerb von Locarno* noch am ehesten einen dramatisch verwendbaren Konflikt sehen, allerdings kaum in der anekdotischen Kurze, wie sie der Novelle eigen ist, die sich so sehr mit der Andeutung des dramatischen Gegenstandes begnügt, dass jede weitere Vermutung über den etwaigen Aufbau mussig bleibt. Der *Findling* und der *Michael Kohlhaas* dagegen sind geradezu biographisch angelegte Novellen, die zwar eine innerlich anschwellende Steigerung auf die Katastrophe hin besitzen, aber keinen dramatischen Aufbau. Eine entbundene Leidenschaft wird nur dann dramatisch gestaltbar, wenn sie auf eine ihr entgegengesetzte trifft, an der sie sich brechen kann. Wenn es eine greifbare, in ihrem Wollen einheitliche Gegenkraft nicht gibt, wenn der Held sich statt dessen mit dem Menschlichen, der Gesellschaft im allgemeinen und in all ihren Erscheinungsformen im Gegensatz findet, wie im *Michael Kohlhaas*, dann ist der Stoff trotz seiner dramatischen Schwüngen episch.

Vielleicht kann man Gundolfs Feststellung geradezu umkehren

und den Novellen Kleists grossere Weltweite zusprechen als seinen Dramen, in denen der Konflikt von Natur aus auf den engsten Raum beschränkt bleiben musste. Obgleich Kleist den Raum, in dem die Novellen spielen—und das trifft auf seine "dramatischen" wie auf seine "epischen" Novellen zu—nur mit ausserordentlicher Knappheit andeutet, findet sich in ihnen mehr reale Welt als in den "von innen nach aussen" lebenden Dramen. Die Landschaft, die in der *Familie Schroffenstein* abstrakt und unbestimmt ist, ist im *Michael Kohlhaas* national und lokal scharf umrissen.

Es kommt darauf an, das Eigene und Besondere der Kleistischen Novellenkunst deutlich zu erkennen. Der deutschen Literatur—von der deutschen Novelle ganz zu schweigen—wird wenig gedient, solange die Novelle als ein Nebenprodukt behandelt wird. Kleist hat vielleicht den entscheidenden Schritt zu einer deutschen Novelle von ubernationalem Gepräge getan—obgleich er selbst so ausschliesslich deutsch war wie kaum ein anderer. Er hat einen Grundstein gelegt, den das 19. Jahrhundert verschüttet hat. Seine Novellen sind freier von einem beengenden "deutschen Milieu" und einer ausserhalb Deutschlands unverständlichen "deutschen Mentalität" als die Kellers und Storms. Seine Helden sind nicht nur "deutsche Menschen"—sondern sie sind Menschen.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

The State University of Iowa

THE NINE HERBS

In the prose epilogue to the Old English "Nine Herbs Charm" the ingredients are enumerated as *mugcwyr̥t, wegbrade þe eastan open sy, lombescyr̥se, attorlaðan, magedan, netelan, wudusuræppel, fille and finul, ealde sapan*.¹ That, as everyone has thought, looks like nine herbs and some "old soap." But the scribe himself, in spite of an implicit confusion in his arithmetic, seems to understand

¹ Cf. E. V. K. Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems* (New York, 1942), pp. cxxxi (Introduction), clxxvii (Bibliography), 119-121 (Text), 209-11 (Notes). The best edition, fully equipped. Consult also J. Hoops, *Über die altenglischen Pflanzennamen* (Freiburg, 1889), pp. 55 ff., H. Bradley, *Archaeo*, cxiii (1904), 144-5; F. P. Magoun, *Archaeo*, clxxi (1937), 29.

what every botanist would insist on, that apples are not herbs. For the instructions continue *gewyrce ða wyrta to duste, mænge wip þa sapan and wip þas æpples gor . sing þæt galdor on ælcra þara wyrta, III ær he hy wyrce, and on þone æppel ealswa*, as if the *æppel* did not belong among the *wyrta* at all. When we dismiss the *wudusuræppel* from the list, however, only eight herbs remain upon it.

Even more annoying is the apparent discrepancy between this prose list and the catalogue of herbs in the poem itself. There can be no doubt that the magic number nine was intended to govern the reckoning (cf. lines 30, 32, 45), nevertheless, ten plant-names appear in the metrical parts of the charm. They are introduced in the following lines: *mucgwyr* 1, *una* 3, *wegbrade* 7, *stune* 14, *stiðe* 16, *attorlaðe* 21, *mægðe* 23, *wergulu* 27, *fille* and *finule* 36, the count being further disturbed by *æppel* in line 34. Commentators have tried in various ways to reduce the number from ten (or eleven) to nine, by saying, for example, that *una*, otherwise unknown, is but a synonym for *mucgwyr*, or that *stune* and *stiðe* are one and the same.²

Both of these suggestions, and indeed all interpretations hitherto offered for the poem, are ruled out by line 30. *Ðas VIII ongan wif nygon attrum*.³ This means, I take it, that in the foregoing twenty-nine lines, the initial, main portion of the charm, nine herbs have already been designated. Preceded in the manuscript by a cross, the next line brings forward a new type of material and the verse moves away somewhat aimlessly. From the list above, however, it would seem as if only eight plants are named in lines 1-29, a defect as puzzling as that in the prose conclusion. But in each instance the difficulty may be overcome if we observe that the reference to *attorlaðe* has been deceptive—two different plants are called for. Notice lines 21-2:

Fleah þu nu, attorlaðe,	seo læsse ða maran,
seo mare þa læssan,	oððæt him begra bot sy.

If we now recognise a greater and a lesser "atterlothe," and admit

² The verses for *stune* and *stiðe* are troublesome because of the pronoun *heo*, and the style is repetitious; hence the belief that only one plant is involved. For *una*, however, the textual distinction is clear enough.

³ The uncertainty about the MS *ongan* does not seriously hinder my assumption about this line. Holthausen's emendation to *magon* is splendid, cf. *Englische Studien*, LIX (1934), 180-3.

that *una*, *stune*, and *stiðe* are distinct, the first division of the charm does contain nine herbs and becomes more intelligible. In turn, if we count *attorlaðan* twice in the prose list, leaving out *uudusuræppel*, that part makes sense too.

Do the nine herbs thus identified in the closing instructions match the nine in the opening section of the poem? Probably so. Several names are common to them both, and the other correspondences can be indirectly demonstrated.⁴

Let it be noted first that the four words which are hard for us to understand, *una*, *stune*, *stiðe*, and *wergulu*, occurring nowhere else in Old English, are absent from the prose account, apparently in their stead, we find four easily understandable words, *lombescyrse*, *netelan*, *fille*, *finul*. It looks as if the commonplace had been deliberately substituted for the rare. Most scholars have seen this possibility, but the precise equations set up to resolve it further have not been convincing.

The misleading feature is this, that *fille* and *finul* occur also in the metrical part of the recipe. A special section, lines 36-44, marked off in the manuscript by crosses at beginning and end, is devoted to them.⁵ It is likely, however, that they are substitutions here as well. The Christian elements suggest that this passage may be a tentative revision of antecedent verses, since the plants are spoken of in a way that connects them with *una* and *stune*. No one, I think, has sufficiently emphasised the following parallels.

Fille and finule	. . .	
Stond heo wið wærce,	stunað heo wið attre,	41
seo mæg wið III	and wið XXX . .	
Una þu hattest,	yldost wyrta;	
þu miht wiþ III	and wið XXX . .	3
Stune hætte þeos wyrta,	heo on stane geweoce,	14
stond heo wið attre,	stunað heo wærce	

Of course it is hard to say which plant goes with which, but the pairs coincide unmistakably. And in this event, the effort to asso-

⁴ Heretofore, everyone has tried to make the prose list jibe with the whole of the metrical version. It has not worked, but the recurrence of *mucgwyrt*, *wegbræde*, *attorlaðe*, and *mægðe* has been the subject of comment since Cockayne's day, cf. *Leechdoms*, III, 348.

⁵ Dobbie omits these crosses, but see *Leechdoms*, III, 30-6. The divisions are noticeable in the context anyhow.

ciate *stune* with *lombescyrse* (so Hoops, Grendon, Dobbie) or with *netele* (so Magoun) can hardly succeed.

Although the remaining names from the verse, *stiðe* and *vergulu*, must therefore stand for "nettle" and "lamb's cress," the respective equations are again uncertain. The analogy of *stiðe* with the adjective *stið* "stiff," as Magoun pointed out, connects it semantically with the nettle. Both Hoops and Bradley support with their considerable authority the translation *vergulu* "nettle," but in arguing from the order of herbs in the two lists they adopted an enumeration that now seems unacceptable, mistaking *attorlaðe* for a single plant, and, in violation of elementary botany, calling the (*wudusur*) *æppel* an herb.

We are enabled, finally, to perceive the structural unity and distinctness of lines 1-29: this is, in a way, the "Nine Herbs Charm," and the rest may be excrescence.⁶ The nine herbs are *mucgwyrt*, *una* (1 e *fille*), *wegbrade*, *stune* (i. e. *finul*), *stiðe* (1 e *netele*), *attorlaðe seo læsse*, *attorlaðe seo mare*, *mægðe*, and *vergulu* (i. e. *lombescyrse*). The function of the lines is plainly ritualistic. Preparatory to placing them in the mortar, the leech would pronounce over each herb, as he held it in his hand, the appropriate incantatory verses. Lacking the vigor of what has gone before it, however, line 30 reads more like a prosaic advertisement for the charm itself.

HOWARD MERONEY

State Teachers College,
Fredonia, New York

SHAKESPEARE'S DOVE-HOUSE

Some years ago, when I was indulging my fancy concerning the possibly autobiographical quality of Shakespeare's talk about the earthquake and the dove-house in *Romeo and Juliet* I, III ("Shakespeare Remembers his Youth in Stratford" in *Essays and Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown*, 1940), I was not aware that a very superior dove-house existed in 1580 and is still to be seen at Wilm-

⁶ Lines 1-29 have not seemed jumbled to anybody, but the incoherence of lines 30-63 prompted Wulker (*Grundriss*, p. 358) and Holthausen (*op cit*) to make wholesale rearrangements of the text. I suppose only that the scribe has ineptly pieced together several different charms.

cote, on or at least very close to the "Asbies" property which the poet's mother had inherited.

Mr. Oliver Baker's interesting book, *In Shakespeare's Warwickshire and the Unknown Years* (1937), reports the purchase (in 1929) and subsequent restoration by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trustees of "the very fine old house [at Wilmcote] which has been popularly known for many years as 'Mary Arden's Cottage,' an absurd name for what was not a cottage but a small manor-house. That it was a house of some importance is made clear by its size and the fine timbers that have been used in its construction, and also by the fact of its possessing a large stone pigeon-house" (p. 225). He goes on to say (p. 227) .

An interesting feature of the Wilmcote farm is the ancient pigeon-house or dovecot. Shakespeare called them dove-houses. It has stone walls pierced with many nest-holes, which walls, as they were built only with local rubble, were, when bought by the Birthplace Trustees, bulging so much with age that it seemed dangerous to enter it. But Mr. William Weir, who is accustomed to repairing ancient and neglected buildings, said that he had saved many church towers that were much worse, and now after his treatment it is quite strong and likely to last for centuries.

"The pigeon-house at Wilmcote," Mr. Baker explains, is a rectangular edifice of limestone rubble, and was no doubt originally plastered. It has two gables of oak timbers, one facing the road and the other towards the farm. In the centre of the ridge is the usual louvre hole roofed over. The building measures twenty feet by seventeen externally, and inside is fifteen feet by twelve, so that walls are only two feet six inches thick, which may account for the dangerous state which it had reached when the Birthplace Trustees repaired it. The presence of a large and ancient pigeon-house in the farmyard at Wilmcote is an interesting fact, as it seems to be evidence that the place was a manor-house, for nobody but a Lord of the Manor or a Rector was permitted to build one (p. 229).

This looks like unsolicited testimony in behalf of readers who get a sense of remembered incident rather than dramatic imagination out of this talk of "sitting in the sun under the dove-house wall" and "Shake! quoth the dove-house." Apparently we can without rebuke assume that the boy was indeed sitting there—on a visit to his step-grandmother, Agnes Arden, who died the following December—when the earthquake of the afternoon of April 6, 1580 occurred; and it may be that the earthquake started the disrepair in the dove-house which Mr. Baker and the Stratford Trustees have had to set right.

TUCKER BROOKE

FALSTAFF'S CLOTHES

During a portion of the time allotted to Falstaff for mustering troops, Sir John, one of His Majesty's captains of infantry, showed great interest in securing fine clothes.

What said Master Dumbleton about the satin for my short cloak and my slops? [he asked his page] I looked he should have sent me two-and-twenty yards of satin, as I am a knight (II Henry IV, IV, 11)

When we consider that his men were "as ragged as Lazarus in the painted cloth" (I Henry IV, IV, 11), Falstaff's sartorial preoccupation seems almost criminal. Yet many Elizabethan captains showed a propensity for exquisite uniforms while their soldiers went almost bare.

This great difference between the dress of officers and that of their men was noticed and condemned by numerous critics of martial discipline in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Barnabe Riche, an army officer himself, felt in 1587 that it was

a president of some errour, to see a Captayne that shall goe all to bee goulded, and to see hys poore Souldiours followe, with neyther Hose to theyr legges nor Shooes to their feete¹

Similarly, Sir John Smythe, noting in his *Certain Discourses* (1590) that "all men of warre in times past haue had speciall care that their soldiers should be fitte apparelled and armed," deplored the custom of modern officers

to suffer their soldiers to goe euill weaponed, and worse armed, and many of them without any kinde of armour at all, and in their apparell all to be tattered and torne, and some of them bare legged, or bare footed like roges. a thing neuer before heard off in any age, that men of warre, and chiefe the English nation, going to the aide of a forraigne Nation, and the countrie and people wonderfull rich and plentifull in all abundance, and their Captaines themselues verie gallant in apparell, and their purses full of gold; that their soldiers should be in such poore and miserable estate²

¹ Barnabe Riche, *A Path-way to Military practise* (1587) As early as 1544, Peter Bethan wrote that a "captayne ought to be felowlyke in hys garmentes, wherby he shall purchase the fauour of the commons And declare hys humbleness, auoydng the name of arrogancie" (*The Preceptes of warre*)

² See the dedication, Sir John Smythe, *Certaine Discourses* (1590).

Matthew Sutchffe, after several years spent observing the English army in his capacity of "Judge Martial" (i e., advocate-general), came to the conclusion that military discipline would be greatly improved if "all men were resolved to bestow more in iron and steele, than in silkes and veluets and golden coates."³

Sir Thomas Digges, Muster-Master General under Leicester in the Low Countries, was incensed at the sight of the best leaders dressed in buff and the worst ones decked out in fine silks Writing sometime before his death in 1595, Digges said

the right valiant Captaine indeed, that (keeping his Band strong and compleat with armed souldiers, gaining nothing aboue his bare Wages, nor will extort vnonestly vpon any Friend or Allie, and his wages (besides his meat and Armes) scarcely sufficient twice in a yeare to buy him a Sute of Buffe) Remayneth as a Man contemned and disgraced Where the other by his Robberies and pickories can florish in Monethly Change of sutes of silke, dawbed with Embroideries of gold and siluer lace, and Iewels also . . . That both abroad and at home also generally this picking lascinuous, carousing Freebooter shall bee called a braue man, a gallant souldier, yea Fit to bee a *Collonell* or great *Commander* that can drinke, and dice &c, with the proudest When the true, valiant, honest, and right Martiall Captaine indeed is not able in such riotous Expences to keep port with others waiting Seruants

But whether these silken, golden, embroydered delicate Captaines . . . Or the other plaine leather, well armed, sober, painefull, valiant Captaines shall doo their Prince or Countrey more honour at a day of Seruice? *

Robert Barret wrote in his *Theorike and Practike of Moderne Warres* (1598) that a soldier "ought to be very moderate, and not ouer garish in his apparell and garments . . . he that is curious in his gate and attire, is neuer like to proue a perfect souldier,"⁴ and two yeares later, Thomas Lord Buckhurst suggested "That no silks, nor silver nor gold lace, be worn in the field, in hose, doublets, cloaks, or gowns, except by the General, Colonels, and principal Governors only, but that all the bravery of the common Captains

* Matthew Sutcliffe, *The Practise, Proceedings, and Lawes of armes*, dedication to the Earl of Essex Further in his book he writes "Fronto published a decree . . . that men should [not] be defiled . . . with silken apparell. But now if gentlemen be not all berayed with silks, they think themselves defiled, & disgraced," p 21.

⁴ Sir Thomas and Dudley Digges, *Foure Paradoxes* (1604), pp 10-11

⁵ Robert Barret, *The Theorike and Practike of Moderne Warres* (1598), p 10.

and officers may be seen in their weapons and armour, and their apparel to be fustial canvas and cloth, and such like."⁶

This condemnation of gaudy military attire by men who were closely associated with soldiers in the latter years of Elizabeth's reign suggests that glittering silk-and-satin officers were both numerous and incompetent. Shakespeare's description of Falstaff as an army captain seeking satin for his uniform was undoubtedly penned with one eye on flesh-and-blood originals and was certainly meant to satirize these offenders.

HENRY J WEBB

Illinois Institute of Technology

SHERIDAN'S "LITTLE BRONZE PLINY"

Since 1799, texts of *The School for Scandal* have usually given the climax of Crabtree's "circumstantial" account of the imaginary duel in approximately these words (v, 11)

the ball struck against a little bronze Shakespeare that stood over the fireplace, grazed out of the window at a right angle, and wounded the postman, who was just coming to the door with a double letter from Northamptonshire

However, in the best of the early versions, and in the very few modern texts based on them, the bust is "a little bronze Pliny."¹ According to the suggestion of R. Clompton Rhodes, "*Possibly Shakespeare was Sheridan's amendment.*"² But Sheridan was known for his extraordinary skill in improving his plays by revision, it was not characteristic of him to flatten out a jest in this fashion. It would seem probable that the explanation is to be found not in the preference of the playwright but in the audience for which he wrote.

Pliny was the classical letter-writer best known to the early eighteenth century, and he was widely regarded as a model of epistolary elegance. For example, Swift defended the comparative

⁶ *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland (1599-1600)*, p. 379

¹ Cf. *British Dramatists from Dryden to Sheridan* (ed. G. H. Nettleton and A. E. Case, Boston, 1939), p. 869.

² *The Plays & Poems of Sheridan* (New York, 1929), II, 101, note.

looseness of his own letter-writing on the ground that (unlike Pliny) he did not write for publication.³ The editors of *The Tatler*⁴ and *The Spectator*⁵ assumed that their readers were interested in Pliny—and familiar with him. But in the latter part of the century allusions to Pliny were less frequent. It is unlikely that there were many busts of Pliny in the homes of private gentlemen, even in such oddly furnished libraries as that of Joseph Surface. It is equally unlikely that the name of Pliny would have been sure to suggest letter-writing to the throng of playgoers in the vast new Drury Lane Theatre.

It would seem that (whether by Sheridan, or by another skilful man of the theater) the sly reference to Pliny the letter-writer, from whose bust the bullet glanced against the postman bearing a double letter, was intentionally replaced by a pointless allusion to the more familiar Shakespeare.

JOHN ROBERT MOORE

Indiana University

MEREDITH'S *THE EGOIST* AS A PLAY

It is not generally known that George Meredith's *The Egoist* (1879) was made into a play by Alfred Sutro and the author in 1898.¹ Meredith's biographers do not mention the fact, and two of them, who knew that the dramatization of the novel was contemplated, were not aware that it had been made.²

The dramatic version of the novel was written, however, although it was never produced on the stage. Meredith records Mr. Sutro's first visit in a letter to Mrs. Walter Palmer, January 29, 1898.

³ Switt's *Correspondence* (ed. F. Elrington Ball, London, 1914), iv, 126, 142, v, 251.

⁴ Nos. 130, 149.

⁵ Nos. 230, 484, 525, 554.

¹ Meredith's only other venture into dramatic composition was the unfinished comedy of manners *The Sentimentalists*, arranged for the stage by J. M. Barrie and presented in its incomplete form at the Duke of York's theater in 1910. See *The Works of George Meredith* (London, 1896-1911), xxxiv, 3-44.

² J. H. Hammerton, *George Meredith in Anecdote and Criticism* (London, 1909), p. 35. S. M. Ellis, *George Meredith, His Life and Friends in Relation to His Work* (London, 1920), p. 257.

A man named Sutro came here from Forbes Robertson some days back, with the proposal to dramatise *The Egoist*, as Forbes has taken to the notion of personating Sir Willoughby. It may be done. Sutro brings me the sketch of the Comedy shortly.³

It is probable that Meredith did not intend at first to do any of the writing himself. Sutro must have brought him a rough outline of the play for his approval and then, in late June or early July of the same year, a typescript of the complete play as he had written it. Meredith writes to Mrs Seymour Trower on July 6, 1898 "if you fail to come we shall not meet, for I have to prepare *The Egoist* for the boards and can go nowhere."⁴ Upon seeing the play as completed by Sutro, then, Meredith decided to take a hand in it himself and revise it completely. I have examined the manuscript, which is in the Altschul Collection in the Yale University Library, and its condition supports this conclusion. Miss Coolidge describes the manuscript as follows:

This manuscript contains 53 pages entirely in Meredith's hand. The remainder, which is typed, contains so many corrections and alterations in Meredith's own hand as to be virtually considered in autograph.⁵

Further evidence that Meredith did not at first intend to have a hand in the preparation of the play is found on the title page of the manuscript. The words "Arranged for the stage by Alfred Sutro" are typed, and just before Sutro's name the following words are written in, probably by Sutro himself, "George Meredith and."

The manuscript remained in the possession of Sutro until 1915, when he presented it in a sale for the benefit of the British Red Cross,⁶ and in 1920 it was in the possession of Gabriel Wells.⁷ Some time before it was presented to the Yale University Library

³ *The Letters of George Meredith Collected and Edited by His Son* (New York, 1912), II, 492.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 496.

⁵ Bertha Coolidge, *A Catalogue of the Altschul Collection of George Meredith in the Yale University Library* (Privately Published, 1931), p. 20. See also M. B. Forman, *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of George Meredith* (Edinburgh, 1922), pp. 59 f. The manuscript contains 131 pages, many of which are typed pages marked out by Meredith; a few are blank but have been numbered for no apparent reason.

⁶ M. B. Forman, *loc. cit.*

⁷ See Clement Shorter's introduction to the printed edition of the play.

by Mr Frank Altschul in 1931, it was owned by Mr Jerome Kern, whose book plate is in it. In 1920, Clement Shorter, a friend of Meredith's in his later years, printed the play privately in an edition limited to thirty copies, the only edition that has ever been published.^{*}

The play follows the outline of the novel very closely, whenever possible lifting the dialogue almost directly from the book, but the action is, of course, telescoped considerably so that each act contains incidents from many chapters. Act I opens with the arrival of the Middletons at Patterne Hall for a month's stay before the marriage of Clara and Sir Willoughby Patterne and covers in all the first ten chapters of the novel. Act II, condensing the next ten chapters, takes place at Vernon Whitford's wild-cherry tree and contains chiefly Clara's first effort to gain her freedom, which was frustrated by Sir Willoughby.

Act III, in two scenes, includes Clara's abortive flight and Sir Willoughby's proposal to Laetitia Dale, which gives Clara the hold over him that she needs. This act covers the next twenty chapters of the novel. Act IV builds up to the farce in which the characters are talking about different engagements without knowing it, condensing chapters forty-one through forty-seven. In the last act the lovers Clara and Vernon are united, and Laetitia accepts Sir Willoughby after he has been properly humbled.

On the whole, the play attempts to include too many of the incidents of the novel, and as a result many of the events seem to lose their meaning as illustrations of egoism, it is difficult to imagine that one could follow the action of the play without prior knowledge of the novel. Action in the dramatic sense is lacking, and the actors come and go as they are needed on or off the stage without regard for probability. Since Meredith's psychological analysis of character and motive has had to be cut out or inadequately rendered into dialogue, anyone who had not read *The Egoist* would get the impression from the play that the novel was simply a shallow and trivial story with an obvious, mechanical plot about a man whom he does not understand in the least. Sir Willoughby Patterne is

^{*} The copy in the Yale Library is number ten, signed and numbered by Shorter. See Coolidge, *op cit*, pp 120 f. Acts II and III, although correctly numbered, have been interchanged in the binding of the manuscript, the mistake has been augmented by misnumbering in the printed edition.

obviously an egoist—too obviously, for all the subtlety of Meredith's character study is lost. The paucity of the play graphically illustrates to what extent Meredith's novels depend upon his own intrusion into the story. That Meredith constructed his novels in scenes and conceived them in dramatic form is clear to any student of Meredith's works. As he says in a letter to G. P. Baker, July 22, 1887, "My method has been to prepare my readers for a crucial exhibition of the personae, and then to give the scene in the fullest of their blood and brain under stress of a fiery situation"⁹. But Meredith never makes the meaning of the action clear on the surface because he is not interested primarily in the action itself, but in the characters and motives behind the action, and these he steps in to explain in his own person.

That the project of dramatizing *The Egoist* was conceived and carried out, however, illustrates a significant fact about Meredith's technique as a novelist: he tended to make the novel dramatic, to discard the protracted life story of an *Oliver Twist* or a *Becky Sharp* for a concentrated, unified presentation of character within the limits of a given situation. Such technique naturally suggested the drama.

RICHARD B. HUDSON

Yale University

A NEW WORDSWORTH LETTER

An unpublished Wordsworth letter, connecting the names of Johnson, Boswell, Reynolds, Beaumont, and Croker, was deposited in the University of Rochester Library several years ago by Howell L. Davies, Esq., of North Denbighshire, Wales. This letter is a companion-piece to a Wordsworth document in the R. B. Adam Collection.

The letter was written to John Wilson Croker on February 24, 1830.

⁹ *Letters*, II, 398. The dramatist who influenced Meredith most was undoubtedly Molière, as can be seen from the many tributes he pays Molière in his *Essay on Comedy and the Uses of the Comic Spirit* (1877). It is significant to note that *The Egoist* was published about two and a half years after Meredith delivered his lecture on comedy, the only full-length novel published between those dates.

Dear Sir,

Having learned with pleasure that you are about to edit a new Edition of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, I think the following Transcript from a blank page of my Copy of that Work may not be uninteresting to you. The words were dictated by the late Sir George Beaumont, and signed by him, in my presence

I remain

dear Sir

Very sincerely yours

Wm Wordsworth

Rydal Mount
near Ambleside
Feb'y 24th

1830

The companion-piece to this new letter is bound into an extra-illustrated volume of the *Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds* in the Adam Collection. It reads as follows:

Sir Joshua Reynolds told me at his Table, immediately after the publication of this Book, that every word in it might be depended upon as if given upon oath. Boswell was in the habit of bringing the proof sheets to his house previously to their being struck off, and if any of the company happened to have been present at the conversation recorded he requested him or them to correct any error—and not satisfied with this he would run over all London for the sake of verifying any single word that might be disputed.

G. H. Beaumont

Rydal Mount
Sept 12. 1826

This note by Sir George Beaumont was first printed by Croker in his edition of Boswell, published by John Murray in 1831 (Preface, i, x). The material was credited to Wordsworth, and Croker also spoke of "the late Sir George Beaumont, whose own accuracy was exemplary, and who lived very much in the society of Johnson's latter days." The note was also printed, from Mr. Adam's 1921 catalogue, by Mr. L. F. Powell in his revision of the Birkbeck Hill *Boswell* (i, 523), both versions differ slightly from the manuscript.

The new letter is without question in Wordsworth's handwriting, but the accompanying document was written by another. Examination of a sample of John Carter's handwriting in the Harvard College Library indicates that it was probably he who copied the material which Wordsworth sent to Croker. John Carter was long a servant and friend of the Wordsworths. He first came to them in 1813, as gardener and handyman. Version C of *The Prelude*

is in his hand, and he saw the poem through the press, probably under the supervision of Christopher Wordsworth¹ Carter was an executor of the poet's will and died in January, 1863² When Wordsworth wrote to Croker in 1830, his eyesight was poor and he often dictated his letters, his wife and his daughter usually served him in this office, but Carter may occasionally have helped The attribution of the document to Carter is not certain, it may have been copied off by Dora Wordsworth.

Croker praised Boswell's diligence, but thought that Reynolds exaggerated He did not, however, have access to the source materials The original proof-sheets and revises of Boswell's great work are in the Adam Collection, and they show very clearly the great pains which the biographer took.³ For example, Boswell wished to know the number of years Mr Villette had served as Ordinary of Newgate He sent a note to Villette and instructed the printers to open the answer, if this failed, they were to ask Mr. Akerman. "Get it somehow" was his final instruction⁴

How Wordsworth first heard about Croker's new edition is not known, nor can the present location of the poet's copy of Boswell be traced. He may have read of the project, or may have heard of it through Robinson or some other literary friend Croker had been at work on the edition since January, 1829, the work itself appeared a year after Wordsworth sent in his contribution⁵

ROBERT F METZDORF

The University of Rochester

¹ Ernest de Selincourt, ed., *The Prelude* Oxford, 1928, pp. xviii, xx

² E J Morley, ed. *Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle* Oxford, 1927, II, 739, 842

³ See R. W. Chapman's article which was included in *Johnson and Boswell Revised* (Oxford, 1928).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 31.

⁵ L J Jennings, ed. *The Croker Papers*. London, 1885, II, 24 I am indebted to L N Broughton, E. L. Griggs, and to Mrs Evelyn M Howe for help in attempting to identify the writer of the document in the Adam Collection

RIME IN *PARADISE LOST*

A number of years ago there appeared a study of the rimes in *Paradise Lost*¹ which contained a number of errors, particularly of omission. The purpose of this note is to provide such emendation as is necessary. Professor Diekhoff examined, among other things, the number of couplets, the number of times riming lines occurred separated by one, two, and three unrimed lines. He found a total of 17 couplets, a total which is correct. However, he lists "sight-highth" (vi, 792-3) as a rime, though the spelling "highth" reveals, and our knowledge of 17th century pronunciation verifies, the fact that the word ends with a "th" not a "t" sound. But, if "sight-highth" is a rime, then D. should have added to his list "highth-might" (ii, 893-4). This would give him a total of 18 couplets. Furthermore, he missed the couplets of ix, 175-6, and x, 544-5, the addition of which should make his total 20 (Two of his listings, xi, 593-4, 666-7, are slips for lines 597-8 and 670-1 respectively.) However, the rime "eat-seat" (ix, 781-2) is probably only an eye-rime since "eat" was used in the past tense and often pronounced "ët" from the 17th century on. Certainly "she eat" is past tense in the passage from which the phrase is taken. "So saying . . . / she pluck'd, she eat"² Dropping out this and the "highth" rimes will leave the total of couplets in *Paradise Lost* still 17.

In his other listings Mr. Diekhoff reports that he found 45 instances where two lines which rimed were separated by one line which did not.³ Actually the number is 56, for the following were overlooked: ii, 29-31, iv, 482-4, v, 350-2, and 857-9, vii, 452-4, viii, 171-3;⁴ ix, 228-30 and 976-8, x, 59-61, and 144-6; and xi, 44-6, and 637-9.⁵

¹ "Rime in *Paradise Lost*," by John S. Diekhoff, *PMLA*, xli (1934), 539-43.

² Further evidence in support of this inference is found in *Paradise Regained*, i, 352, and *Psalm lxxx*, line 22.

³ He lists lines 189-91 instead of 190-2 of Bk. ii. But this is a "highth-might" coupling, and is no rime. His total should then be 44.

⁴ If D does not consider "Paradise-wise" a rime, he should not have listed "Paradise-flies" of Bk. v, 274-5 as one.

⁵ D lists lines 742-4 of Bk. xi as lines 736-8.

D's third classification is of riming lines separated by two lines not riming. His total is 52, but I find the number to be 72. The following instances have been overlooked: I, 503-6, 553-6 (584-7 are listed by D as 582-7), II, 435-8, (514-7 are probably a rime), IV, 593-6, 729-32, 825-8, V, 715-18, 797-800, 844-7,⁶ VI, 182-5, 530-3,⁷ 610-4, 658-61, VII, 251-4, 562-5, VIII, 399-402, IX, 321-4, 720-3, 804-7, 1101-4, X, 712-5, 934-7.

In his fourth category—two riming lines separated by three lines not riming—my figures differ a good deal from D's. He says the total is 27, I find 51. Since D does not list his findings, I append all of mine

I, 183-7, 193-7, 425-9, 582-6, II, 113-7, 230-4, 278-82, 320-4, 328-32, 444-8, 622-6, 685-9, 858-62, 950-4, 954-8, 1002-6, 1005-9, III, 51-55, 129-33, 559-63, 676-80, IV, 115-9, 368-72, V, 62-6, 76-80, 901-5, VI, 187-91, 349-53, VII, 490-4, 556-60, VIII, 37-41, 128-32, 475-9, IX, 45-9, 138-42, 310-14, 635-9, 702-6, 907-11, 1068-72, 1094-8, X, 198-202, 548-52, 921-5, 937-41, XI, 6-10, 154-8, 449-53, 568-72; XII, 362-6, 551-5.

J. M. PURCELL

Marquette University

SHELLEY'S FIRST PUBLISHED REVIEW OF *MANDEVILLE*

Shelley's long review of *Mandeville*, by William Godwin, was published in *The Examiner* on 28 December, 1817. A short review of this novel which appeared in *The Morning Chronicle*, 9 December, 1817, has hitherto escaped notice, although Shelley made reference to it in a letter.

On 1 December Shelley wrote to William Godwin. "Mandeville has arrived this evening. Mary is now reading it—and I am like a man on the brink of a precipice. . . ." By 7 December, Shelley had read *Mandeville*, he wrote Godwin, praising the book highly. Godwin cut this laudatory paragraph from Shelley's letter, changed the references to himself from the second to the third person, and

⁶ D lists v, 794-7 "assume-introduce" and 841-4 "obscur'd-done." These are, of course, slips of the eye or pen, probably for the two examples I give.

⁷ "groan-grown" are as much a rime as "right-upright," lines 624-7, which D. lists, "fight-highth" of lines 296-300 are not a rime.

sent this excerpt to *The Morning Chronicle*, where it appeared on 9 December, under the heading, "Extract of a Letter from Oxfordshire." Shelley saw the paragraph in print and wrote Godwin on the 11th

If I had believed it possible you should send any part of my letter to the *Chronicle*, I should have expressed more fully my sentiments of *Mandeville*, and of the author The effect of your favourable consideration has emboldened me to write—not a volume but a more copious statement of my feelings as they were excited by *Mandeville* This I have sent to the Examiner

ADALINE E GLASHEEN

Wheaton College

A NOTE ON ARNOLD'S "CIVILISATION IN THE UNITED STATES"

In his essay "Civilisation in the United States" Matthew Arnold comments strongly upon an American volume "entitled *Our Country*" and quotes from it strikingly The book¹ is *Our Country. Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (New York, copyright 1885). The title-page indicates it as "By Rev. Josiah Strong, Pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Cincinnati, O. With an Introduction by Professor Austin Phelps, D. D." Then comes this quotation from Emerson "We live in a new and exceptional age. America is another name for Opportunity. Our whole history appears like a last effort of the Divine Providence in behalf of the human race." Strong wrote numerous passages that may be properly characterized in Arnold's words, used earlier in his essay, as "tall talk and self-glorification" The Introduction by Dr. Phelps is eulogistic, and urges serious consideration of the facts presented in the book, and immediate action of the sort proposed in it. Phelps ends his remarks (p. vii) by declaring "The principles of such a strategic wisdom should lead us to look on these United States as first and foremost the chosen seat of enterprise for the world's conversion. Forecasting the future of Christianity, as statesmen forecast the destiny of nations, we must believe that

¹ For specified reasons, I previously thought the book "apparently" *Our Country: or, The American Parlor Keepsake*—see *English Prose of the Victorian Era*, ed. C. F. Harrold and W. D. Templeman (1938), p. 1298, n. 23.

it will be what the future of this country is to be. As goes America, so goes the world, in all that is vital to its moral welfare. . . ." Such information, and more that might be cited, give a good deal of justification for Arnold's attitude toward the book. Arnold has quoted verbatim from pp. 168 and 169, and his paraphrased or condensed passages on pp. 169 and 170.

Arnold carries his ridicule too far, however, and he weakens his attack on the book and on civilization in the United States when he misinterprets the meaning of *nervous*. Josiah Strong asserted "Our national genius is Anglo-Saxon, but not English, its distinctive type is the result of a finer nervous organization, which is certainly being developed in this country." He followed this immediately by a quotation from "'Beard's American Nervousness,' p. 287":

The history of the world's progress from savagery to barbarism, from barbarism to civilization, and, in civilization, from the lower degrees toward the higher, is the history of increase in average longevity, corresponding to, and accompanied by, increase of nervousness. Mankind has grown to be at once more delicate and more enduring, more sensitive to weariness and yet more patient of toil, impressible, but capable of bearing powerful irritation, we are woven of finer fiber, which, though apparently frail, yet outlasts the coarser, as rich and costly garments oftentimes wear better than those of rougher workmanship.

Strong, making use of Beard, proceeded thus: "The roots of civilization are the nerves, and other things being equal, the finest nervous organization will produce the highest civilization." It is this that Arnold leaps upon. But he leaps upon it with the weight of an unjustified interpretation, and hence with a false statement.

Undoubtedly the Americans are highly nervous, both the men and the women. A great Paris physician says that he notes a distinct new form of nervous disease, produced in American women by worry about servants. But this nervousness, developed in the race out there by worry, overwork, want of exercise, injudicious diet, and a most trying climate—this morbid nervousness our friends ticket as the fine susceptibility of genius, and cite it as a proof of their distinction, of their superior capacity for civilisation!

Unhappily for Arnold's point, it is *not* the "morbid" type of nervousness that his "friends" Beard and Strong and Colonel Higginson were talking about.

WILLIAM D. TEMPLEMAN

University of Illinois

REGARDING THE PREFIX *ý-* IN OLD NORSE
ý-miss, 'VICISSIM'

All the standard ON grammars derive the *ý-* in *ý-miss* from the negative prefix **ū-* with *ι*-umlaut (PGmc **un-missaz* > PN **ū-missaR* > **ū-missR* > *ý-miss*). Falk-Torp,¹ however, derive the *ý-* from the adverbial particle *í-* (< **in-*) with labialization > *ý-* when an *u* of the end syllable followed, as in **ímsum* > *ýmsum*, dat plur form, the *í-* then being leveled out throughout the paradigm in favor of *ý-*. "Wahrscheinlich ist *ýmiss* aus *ímiss* (so vereinzelt in anord sowie in norw. dial.) in formen wie *ýmsum* entstanden, wo *m* und *u* zusammenwirkten. Das adj. scheint von einer verbindung *í miss* gebildet (vgl lat *invice*m)" There are two serious objections to this derivation (1) There are no parallels for the leveling of *í* to *ý* in an adjectival paradigm (cf. *ills illu(m)*, where the original *í* remained unaffected by labialization throughout the paradigm in spite of the combined influence of *l* and *u*), and (2) the rare forms² with *ι-* (cf. *i-miss*, etc.) instead of *ý-* can easily be explained as due to delabialization³ of short *y* (cf. *ýmsir* > *ymsir* > *imsir*³, etc.). On the other hand, if the *ý-* in *ý-miss* is due to *ι*-umlaut of **ū-* (< **un-*), how is this anomalous appearance of the *ι*-umlaut of the negative prefix **ū-* to be explained (cf. *ú-líkr* without *ι*-umlaut)? To explain this anomaly we must first of all determine just exactly what force the negative prefix **ū-* had in the compound **ū-miss*

Since the negative prefix *ú-* otherwise never suffered *ι*-umlaut the suspicion is justified that the *ι*-umlaut of **ū-* in *ý-miss* was due to the anomalous force of the prefix in this particular word. The normal usage of the negative prefix *ú-* (*ó-*) is to negate the positive sense of the element to which it is attached (cf. *ú-fúss* 'not eager,' etc.). That the negative prefix **ū-* in **ū-miss* did not have this force is obvious from the fact that *ý-miss* does not mean

¹ *Norw.-Dan. Etym. Wtb.*, p. 1408, sub *Ymse*; cf also Sigmund Feist, *Etym. Wtb. der got. Sprache*², p. 363a, sub *missō*. Feist derives ON *ýmiss* from **ī-miss*, but does not explain how an original **ī* here became *ý*, so likewise August Fick, *Vergl Wtb der indo germanischen Sprachen*, p. 321. "... an *ýmiss* (aus *ī-miss*) abwechselnd"

² I find no examples of forms with *í*, contrary to Falk-Torp (*ibid*).

³ Cf. Noreen, *Altisl. Grammatik*⁴, § 114

'not alternate,' but still retains the positive force of the second element *-miss* 'alternate' (cf Goth *missō* 'alternately'). It follows then that if **ū-* had not suffered *i*-umlaut, a form **ū-miss* would have signified just the opposite of what the word means, viz, 'not alternate'. The simplex *-miss* signified 'now one, now the other,' which idea may be viewed from a negative standpoint, viz, 'neither this nor that, but now one and now the other'. Negative particles often imply a distributive, indefinite force (cf the particle Goth *-hun*⁴ = *-gr* *-ka*, originally negative with indefinite implication; cf Goth *m manna-hun* 'no one whatsoever' ON *man-gr* 'no one,' but *hvat-ka* 'anything whatsoever' = Eng 'whatnot'). Evidently then we have in *ý-miss* an example of the negative prefix **ū-* in this indefinite function as a double negative re-enforcing the negative implication in the simplex *-miss*. Since the prefix **ū-* in no wise altered⁵ the sense of the simplex *-miss*, it was no longer felt as a negative prefix (as in *ú-fúss*) but as an integral part of the compound and thus regularly suffered *i*-umlaut > *ý-*. On the other hand, the *ú-* in the type *ú-líkr* preserved its negative force and therefore escaped the influence of *i*-umlaut in conformity with those compounds in which the *ú-* was phonetically correct (cf *ú-fúss* *ú-líkr*). Such a leveling could not apply in the case of *ý-miss*, since the original **ū-* here had lost its negative force and therefore was no longer associated with the negative prefix.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

HYMSELVEN LIK A PILGRYM TO DESGISE
TROIUS, V, 1577

And ofte tyme he was in purpos grete
Hymselven like a pilgrym to desgise,
to seen hire . . .

To visit the Greek camp disguised as a pilgrim in order to see

⁴ For a discussion of this negative particle compare George K. Anderson, "p_{rs}-Compounds in Gothic," *JEGPh.*, Vol xxxv (1936), p. 36 ff

⁵ For the negative force of *-miss* compare its usage as the first member of a compound, as in *miss-líkr* (Goth *missa-leiks*) 'unlike, different' = *ú-líkr* 'not like'

Criseyde is but one of a number of unexecuted plans entertained by Troilus at one time or another in the course of the fifth book of Chaucer's romantic epic tragedy. Most readers have, I suspect, like myself read this glaringly anachronistic passage¹ with little more than a passing smile of condescension, for to talk about pilgrims in Troy is much like labelling the Greek seer Amphiaras ('Αμφιάραος) a "bishop" (*Troil*, II, 104)² Both points betray the medieval man's egregious ignorance of Classical archaeology and Classical everyday life!

A pilgrim disguise is, to be sure, in terms of Trojan life a gross anachronism, but in introducing it at this point in his narrative Chaucer is guilty less of a whimsical invention than of being a follower or echoer of a well established migratory motif,³ which happened to fit reasonably well into the frame of his narrative. The basis of this popular motif rests on an obvious reality described by Joseph Hall "As minstrels, palmers and beggars moved about freely and without question, men wishing to disguise themselves usually adopted the dress of these classes."⁴ Hall then proceeds to adduce a number of examples from ME romance and balladry, though he has overlooked the present conspicuous instance in the *Troilus*. Pilgrim disguise, adopted in order to find one's beloved, as projected at least by Troilus, is common also in French⁵ and German⁶ metrical romances. That this motif of pilgrim disguise as used by Chaucer and other ME writers may have had its origin or gained special momentum on the Continent rather than in England is suggested, if nothing more, by the history of the earliest instance in ME, namely, in Lawman's *Brut* (ll. 30730, 36 ff.).

¹ Not in Boccaccio and not commented on by Skeat, Root, or Robinson

² The passage is adapted from Statius's *Thebais*, VII, 816-23

³ See Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*, IV (Bloomington, Ind., 1934), 499, § K 2357 2; cp K 1817 2 to which I am indebted for most references that follow.

⁴ *King Horn: A Middle English Romance* (Oxford, 1901), p. 154, n. to l. 1052. This is the major MS reference to this motif and should replace "Wells 9" of Stith Thompson.

⁵ Christian Boje, *Ueber d. altfranzös. Roman v. Beuve de Hamion* ("Beihefte z. Zs. f. roman. Philol.," XIX, Halle, 1909), p. 70.

⁶ J. Thien, *Uebereinstimmende u. verwandte Motive in den deutsch. Spielmannsepen*, etc (prog. Hamburg, 1882), pp. 16-17. For a good modern instance cp Melchtal's "Ich war verkleidet dort in Pilgerstracht," Schiller, *Wilhelm Tell*, I 1062.

The passage in question rests ultimately on Geoffrey of Monmouth, near the end of the *Historia Regum Britanniae* (bk XII, cap 7, *ad init*), where we are told that Brianus, after landing in Southampton (*Portus Hamonis*), exchanges clothes with a beggar (*pauper*) before proceeding to York in search of his sister.¹ For Geoffrey's beggar Wace in his poem substitutes "*pèlerin*" (l. 14698, ed La Roux de Lincy) and in this is followed by Lawman, the Welsh translation likewise has "pilgrim" here (see Griscom, *loc cit*)

At all events it is clear that in the Troilus passage we have to do rather with a migratory motif familiar to medieval readers than with any casual invention of Chaucer

FRANCIS P MAGOUN, JR

Harvard University

CHAUCEUR'S EIGHT YEARS' SICKNESS

Dr Marshall W. Stearns, in his "Note on Chaucer's Attitude toward Love" (*Speculum*, xvii, 570-74), has much to say that is perspicacious and well-grounded on the general subject, though perhaps some comment should have been offered on Gower's testimony¹ that

in the floures of his [Chaucer's] youthe
In sondri wise, as he wel couthe,
Of ditees and of songes glade,
The whiche he for mi [Venus's] sake made,
The lond fulfild is overal

As he himself realizes, Dr. Stearns is treading on more dangerous ground in proposing that Chaucer's reference in the *Book of the Duchess* to "a sickness that I have suffered this eight year" has autobiographic value. A W. Ward, Ten Brink, Furnivall, and Dr. Galway, all scholars of standing, have concurred in this opinion, though their specific interpretations have differed.² What, I take it, has impressed even those who recognized the conventionality and

¹ Ed Acton Griscom (New York, 1929), p. 522, l 5; ed Edmond Faral, *Les légendes arthuriennes*, III (Paris, 1929), 293, ch 196, l 5

² Gower, *Complete Works*, ed. G O Macaulay (Oxford, 1901), III, 466.

³ A W Ward, *Life of Chaucer* (London, 1879), p 53 B. Ten Brink, *History of English Literature*, trans. W. C Robinson (New York, 1893), II, 1, 45 ff F J Furnivall, *Trial-Forwards* (London, 1871), p. 35. *MLR*, xxxiii (1938), 1764.

the second-hand nature of much in the poem is the precise duration, eight years, assigned to the malady. I was myself impressed, and considered it the strongest argument for Dr Galway's identification of Chaucer's sovereign lady with Princess Joan of Kent, who married the Black Prince eight years before the death of Duchess Blanche. Why would Chaucer have specified eight years unless he had actually been an unrequited lover, or played the conventional part of one, for that space of time?

An hitherto unnoted fact has, however, convinced me that the eight years are just one more of the poet's obligations to his French models. In the *Jugement du Roi de Behaigne*, composed by Machaut before 1346, the poet overhears a lady confess the love-lorn state of her heart to a knight in the following verses.³

Sire, il a bien set ans ou huit entiers,
Que mes cuers a esté sers et rentiers
A Bonne Amour, si qu'apris ses sentiers
Ay très m'enfance,
Car dès premiers que j'eus sa congnoissance
Cuer, corps, pour, vie, avoir et puissance
Et quanqu'il fu de moy, mis par plaisance
En son servage . . .

Here, then, Chaucer might have got his notion of eight years as a specific time for the service of love. And if Chaucer were to borrow the notion at all, there was no more likely place. For as Kittredge demonstrated, the *Book of the Duchess* is a mosaic of lines derived largely from this very poem of Machaut's.⁴ Legouis remarked:⁵ "French poets are often put under contribution, even where the elegy seems most personal." The exquisite description of the Lady White, which one would expect to contain some details of form and feature peculiar to the dead Duchess Blanche, is an artistic translation, but still a translation, of the portrait of the knight's lady in the *Jugement du Roi de Behaigne*.

Moreover, the very passage quoted from Machaut above is among those Chaucer took and expanded.⁶

"Syr," quod he, "sith first I kouthe
Have any maner wyt fro youthe,

³ Machaut, *Oeuvres*, ed E Hoepffner (Paris, 1908), I, 62

⁴ *PMLA*, xxx (1915), 1 ff *MP*, vii, 465 ff.

⁵ E Legouis, *Geoffrey Chaucer*, trans L. Lailavoix (London, 1913), p. 79.

⁶ *BD*, vss 759-62.

Or kyndely understandyng
 To comprehende, in any thyng,
 What love was, in myn owne wyt,
 Dredeles, I have ever yit
 Be tributarye and yiven rente
 To Love, hooly with good entente,
 And through plesaunce become his thral
 With good wille, body, hert, and al
 Al this putte I in his servage "

In these lines there is every thought and even some of the very words of Machaut. Only the reference to seven or eight years is missing. Can we doubt that this is because Chaucer had already used it in reference to his hopeless malady?

Any biographic construction based on the duration of the poet's love-sickness must therefore be abandoned, and with it goes, I fear, the one solid prop for Dr. Galway's elaborate and ingenious hypothesis of a decorous romance between Chaucer and the Fair Maid of Kent.⁷ We must return, however reluctantly, to the attitude of extreme skepticism adopted by Lounsbury and Sypherd⁸ in regard to the eight years' love-sickness of the poet.

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS

Columbia University

⁷ That the God of Love in *LGW* represents the Black Prince, returned from the grave, while Alceste is his widow, the Maid of Kent, seems most unlikely since Alceste was renowned for her fidelity to Admetus and could not therefore with any propriety be the widow of the God of Love. That the God of Love calls the daisy (*LGW*, F, vs 321) "my relyke, digne and delitable," and that this is a reference to Alceste as his "relict" seems to be most hazardous since "relict" in the sense of widow is not recorded by the *NED* until 1545, and "relike," as Prof. Robinson pointed out (Cambridge ed., 1933, p. 957), occurs twice in the *Romaunt of the Rose* in the sense of treasure. The *Troilus* miniature, representing Chaucer reciting before the court, may very well depict the Princess Joan in the foreground, but this fact demonstrates no particular relation to the poet. Two remaining arguments, however, may have some value. It is curious that in the *Complaint to Pity* there should be reference to the "rial excellence" and the "regalye" of the personified virtue, for she, as the last stanza shows, is identified with the poet's lady. It is also curious that in the F version of the prolog of *LGW* widows faithful to the memory of their husbands are not mentioned together with clean maidens and true wives, but in the G version, written long after Joan's death, steadfast widows are twice mentioned in this connection (vss. 283, 295). This

THE ENGLISH PROSE TRANSLATION OF
LEGENDA AUREA

In the prologue to his *Golden Legend*, Caxton declares that he has made his compilation from "a legend in French, another in Latin, and a third in English."¹ Of the English translation eight manuscripts survive, all copies, and all representing one version,² made before 1438. The colophon of Douce 372 reads "And also here endith the lives of Seintis that is callid in Latynne *Legenda aurea* and in Englyssh the gylte legende, the whiche is drawen out of Frensshe into Englysshe, the yere of oure lorde's a M CCCC and xxxviiij, bi a synfulle wretche . . ."³ This clear statement that the work was done by a single translator who used a French version of the *Legenda* is contradicted by the colophon of Harleian 630 "compiled and drawen into englyssh bi worthi clerkes and doctours of Diuinite suengly aftre þe tenur of þe latin."⁴ Comparison of the English with manuscripts and printed editions of the popular French version made before 1348 by the Hospitaller Jehan de Vignai leads Dr. Butler to believe that the translator depended on the French rather than on the original Latin, although some corrections may have been introduced from the latter.⁵ Moreover the colophon of Douce 372 deserves special credence because it appears to be the composition of the translator himself, whereas the Harleian colophon was probably added by a scribe. It is of course possible that the work of translation was shared by several

change may be explained, as Miss Galway does, by the fact that the mention of steadfast widows might possibly have hurt the feelings of Joan, who had remarried after the death of her first husband.

¹ T. R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer* (New York, 1892), I, 210-24. *MLN*, xx (1905), 240-43.

² *The Golden Legend*, ed. F. S. Ellis, Temple Classics, 1931, I, p. 2.

³ Harleian 4775, Harleian 630, Egerton 376, Lansdowne 350, Lambeth 72, B. M. Add 11, 565, B. M. Add 35, 298. See Pierce Butler, *Legenda Aurea, Légende Dorée, Golden Legend*, Baltimore, 1899, pp. 50, 147 ff. "The Ashburnham manuscript" is now B. M. Add 35, 298. Several others, containing a few legends each, need not be mentioned here.

⁴ F. Madan, *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, Oxford, IV, p. 610.

⁵ Butler, p. 54.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

persons, some of whom worked from the Latin, while others used the French intermediary, but the general character of the vocabulary points to a fairly consistent use of the French.

More than one critic has thought the English of this translation superior to that of Caxton's version. If the "synfulle wretche" had set his name to his work, he might now have an honored place among the writers of clean English praised by Mr. R. W. Chambers.⁸ One conjecture as to his identity is inevitable. Osbern Bokenham, the Augustinian friar who made metrical translations of thirteen lives of women saints, writes in the first chapter of his *Mappula Angliae* (before 1445) "For as moche as in the englishe boke the whiche y haue compiled of legenda aurea and of oþer famous legendes . . . is oftene-tyme in lyvis of seyntis, Of seynt Cedde, seynt Felix, seynt Edwarde, seynt Oswalde, and many oþer seyntis of Englonde . . ." Many years ago Dr. Horstmann regretfully dismissed Bokenham's claim to the authorship of the extant English translation because the manuscripts known to him did not contain the four saints mentioned.⁹ Later students of Bokenham have not, so far as I know, reconsidered the possibility in the light of manuscripts found after Horstmann's comment was made.¹⁰ The fact is that three of those added by Dr. Butler to Horstmann's list contain some of the legends mentioned by Bokenham. S. Chad is in B. M. Add. 11, 565, SS. Chad, Oswald, and Edward, King and Martyr, are in Lambeth 72 and B. M. Add. 35, 298. The latter also contains S. Edward, King and Confessor. S. Felix (of East Anglia), the only saint mentioned by Bokenham and not found in these manuscripts, may actually be in one or more of them, unnoticed by cataloguers.¹⁰ The original *Legenda* contained two saints of this name, and the addition or substitution of the English Felix might easily pass unmarked.

The chronology of Bokenham's life and writings would make this work, if it be his, a product of his early middle age. He was born

⁸ "Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School" in *Harpfield's Life of More, EETS.*, 186, pp. xiv-clxxv.

⁹ Edited by C. Horstmann from the unique MS, Harl. 4011 f, 144 ff., *Eng. St.*, x, 188.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹¹ G. H. Gerould, *Saints' Legends*, Boston, 1916, p. 190; Mary Serjeantson, *Bokenham's Legendys of Hooly Wummen, EETS.*, 206 (1938), p. xvii.

¹² I am dependent on catalogues for descriptions of all manuscripts except Harleian 4775.

about 1393, and the translation was made before 1438, the date of Douce 372. In view of the fact that he declares that he translated the *Legenda Aurea* adding, among others, four English saints, and that three of these are found in three manuscripts of an English translation, the date of which harmonizes with the known dates of his life, it would seem reasonable to suppose that the East Anglian friar is the translator of the pre-Caxton Golden Legend. Intensive study of vocabulary and syntax may confirm or disprove this attribution. The purpose of this note is merely to point out that the decision against Bokenham's claim is based on a premise now invalidated by the contents of three manuscripts.

SISTER MARY JEREMY, O. P.

Rosary College,
River Forest, Illinois

REVIEWS

The Legends of Ermanric. By CAROLINE BRADY. University of California Press Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1943. Pp. xii + 341. \$3.00.

This "completely rewritten" dissertation (p. vii) is an attempt to prove that the good Ermanric of legend derived from Ostrogothic tradition, the evil Ermanric, from the tradition of peoples subjugated by him. In the course of her argument the author surveys the references to Ermanric in history and story, and studies the legends about him in Ostrogothic Italy, West Scandinavia (Norway and Iceland), Denmark, England and Germany, devoting a chapter to each. In a final chapter she takes up the transmission of the legends and presents her conclusion. She adds a table of abbreviations, a bibliography, and an index. The book is well written and well printed.

If the author's hypothesis about the two Ermanrics had any factual basis, one would expect to find the good king celebrated in South Germany (which learned of him from the Ostrogoths of northern Italy), the evil king, in Scandinavia (to which had migrated a branch of the Eruli, one of the subject peoples). The contrary is the case, of course, and the hypothesis falls to the ground. We have no evidence that the Eruli or any other subject people made any contribution whatever to the tale of Ermanric. The earliest form of the legend, that of Jordanes, is Ostrogothic,

and presents Ermanric favorably, but not wholly so, the shady side of his character also comes out, and affords a sufficient basis for his development into the evil king of later story.

Ermanric's ruthless legalistic heathen justice quite naturally, in the course of time, came to be thought of as tyranny and cruelty. The OE poem *Deor* gives us the only literary record of this stage. In this as in other matters the poet's source of information was presumably North German, a point not mentioned in Miss Brady's discussion (p. 161). The next stage turns Ermanric into an unnatural slayer of his own kin, but saves his character (at the expense of his intelligence) by making him the dupe of an evil counselor. Miss Brady points out (p. 253) that this stage was known to the tenth century writer Flodoard, but she fails to note that Flodoard was merely reporting the exhortations of Fulco, a ninth-century worthy. Fulco in turn got his information *ex libris Teutonicis*, and such books are best dated from the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth, when Charlemagne interested himself in getting native story recorded, after the English missionaries had brought to the Continent the English habit of writing in the vernacular.

In all versions of this stage the evil counselor figures,¹ with a single exception the annalistic notice of *circa* 1000, the so-called *Annales* version. According to H. Schneider, "der böse Rat . . . fehlt aber nur durch Zufall" even in the *Annales* (see *Germ. Heldensage*, I, 241), but since the annalist transfers the counselor's cunning to Ermanric himself his omission of the counselor was surely no accident. The annalist's representation of Ermanric as *astutior in dolo, largior in dono* is obviously a fusion product: the evil counselor contributed the cunning, his dupe the generosity. This characterization of Ermanric appears nowhere in story, and is to be taken as a personal construction of the annalist's, its neat rhetorical form is worthy of special note.

Miss Brady emphasizes the fact that in the South German monuments the evil counselor is superfluous, since Ermanric has become "the blackest of tyrants, capable of committing any nefarious deed" (p. 252). Since these monuments are all late, one would naturally conclude that the early conception of the king as dupe faded in the course of time, in South German story, with a consequent reduction in the importance of the evil counselor. The horrible deeds attributed to Ermanric ended, naturally enough, by making him as evil as they. In other words, the evil counselor, "inorganic" (*l. c.*) in late story, is a relic, there, of earlier story in which he was highly organic. But this is not Miss Brady's view. She thinks that the evil counselor of South German tradi-

¹ But *Hamðismál* and *Ragnarsdrápa* presuppose rather than tell the story of Randvér and Svanhildr and therefore make no mention of the evil counselor. Cf. Miss Brady's judicious comment, p. 54.

tion was borrowed from North German tradition (l c) She does not make it clear why the South German story-tellers would borrow a character they had no real use for. And elsewhere (pp. 230 f.) she argues that Sibicho was known as an evil character all over Germany as early as the middle of the ninth century The early South German evil character Sibicho is obviously the proper source for the late South German evil character of the same name, and the theory of borrowing from the North is needless

Miss Brady makes much (pp 178 f, 222 f.) of the motivation found for the evil counselor's wicked course. But, as Schneider rightly observes (*op. cit.*, I, 240), "Die Begründung von Sibichs Verhalten ist novellistische Zutat ohne erkennbare Quelle, die Bosheit des Verraters bedarf an sich nicht der Motivierung." In the nature of the case the introduction of this trait involved a blackening of Ermanric's character Presumably this blackening is not older than the trait of which it makes an integral part Miss Brady is taking these untraditional elements too seriously when she argues (p 179) that Ermanric "is fundamentally to blame" for what happens. In the traditional tale he is a dupe and the evil counselor gets the blame for his lord's misdeeds

Limitations of space keep me from taking up many of the things in this book which need comment or correction. The author's discussion of *Widsith* 115 may serve to illustrate her methods. This line reads,

Seccan sohte ic ond Beccan, Seafolan ond Peodric.

Two kings famous in history and story bore the name *Peodric* King Theodoric the Great, an Ostrogoth, and King Theodoric son of Clovis, a Frank. Presumably the poet here refers to one of them Which one? The decision obviously depends on the identification of Seafola, with whom Peodric is paired Miss Brady tells us that Jiriczek "made out a convincing case for identifying Seafola as the Sabene of the Wolddietrich story" (p 171).² If so, then Peodric is to be identified with Theodoric the Frank, for it is the Frank, not the Ostrogoth, who figures in the Wolddietrich story Yet elsewhere Miss Brady says that Seafola and Peodric "may be either Goths or Franks" (p 155), and that "a decisive conclusion can never be reached" (p. 158). If by "decisive" Miss Brady means mathematically certain, she is right, but in the

² She adds, "the identification is by no means undisputed (cf, e g, Chambers, *Wid.*, pp 41 ff.)," but she fails to warn the unwary reader that Jiriczek's paper was written in criticism of Chambers' views as expressed in *Wid.*, pp 41 ff, and that Chambers made no reply. His silence, if I am any judge (and I knew him well), means that he felt he had no case And nobody else has written a reply to Jiriczek. His paper still stands, after nearly a quarter of a century, as the definitive treatment of the point. And such it bids fair to remain indefinitely This question has been settled.

study of heroic legend we deal with probabilities only, and Jiriczek established the overwhelming probability that Seafola, and therefore Peodric, belong to some version of the Woldfdietrich story

This granted, we may proceed further, since the chances are that the other two names in the line likewise belong to this story.³ A major character in the Woldfdietrich story is the faithful retainer Berchtung, and the names *Berchtung* and *Becca* may legitimately be taken as variant short forms of one original *viz.*, a full name containing the element *berht*.⁴ What was this full name? Since Theodoric the Frank's son Theodberht played a historical part out of which Berchtung's legendary part might readily have grown, I took it that *Theodberht* was the full name to which the short forms *Berchtung* and *Becca* answer. Finally, I recognized in *Betto* another legitimate short form of *Theodberht*, with the usual hypocoristic assimilation. *rht* > *tt*. From *Betto*, by addition of the hypocoristic k-suffix, *Becca* is obviously derivable *Bettca* > *Becca*. But *Becca* may as easily be derived from the full name *Theodberht*, by loss of the name-element *theod-* and addition of the k-suffix. *Berhtca* > *Becca*. Unable to choose between these two equally good derivations, I mentioned them both and let it go at that (*Englische Studien*, LXXIII, 182)

Miss Brady comments "the suggestion that it [i.e., *Becca*] can be derived from either *Theodberht* or *Betto*, that 'it all comes to the same thing,' is enough to shake one's faith in the hypocoristic suffix" (p. 172). Such carping seems better suited to an election campaign than to a scientific investigation. Contributory (*lc*) to the shaking of Miss Brady's faith is the circumstance that, on p. 127 of my ed of *Widsith*, I said, "the chances are that the full name of King Becca [of line 19] began with *berht*." Undoubtedly I ought to have said "began or ended" here. The scanty evidence collected in F. Stark's *Kosenamen der Germanen* indicates that hypocoristic names made with *berht* may go back to full names either beginning or ending in that element (five cases; ratio, 3/2). But I was not really concerned, in the passage quoted, with the position of the name-element. I was discussing Redin's suggestion that *Becca* was "a short form of compounds with *Beorn*, *Beorht-*

³ Miss Brady is more positive. She says, "It is within the line that we find the linking of names that is the clue to the story lying behind the allusion, there is, with few exceptions, no necessary connection between the heroes named in successive lines" (p. 155). This implies that there is a "necessary connection" between the heroes named in the same line. Here Miss Brady goes too far. In the Third Thula of *Widsith* such a connection may safely be reckoned likely (though by no means necessary) if conflicting evidence is wanting, in the First Thula we have no reason to presume any connection.

⁴ Heusler in his famous paper, "Heldennamen in mehrfacher Lautgestalt" (*ZfdA* LV), established the fact of such variation in heroic legend, and everyday experience gives us familiar parallels: thus, from *Elizabeth* are derived the short forms *Beth*, *Betty*, *Betsy*, *Bessie*, *Bess*, etc.

...” and, in concluding that the chances favored *Beorht* rather than *Beorn*, I carelessly followed Redin’s form of expression. The position of *berht* in the full name answering to *Becca 19* cannot, in fact, be determined. Here we have no story to limit the linguistic possibilities, and *Becca* is therefore derivable from any name containing the element. In line 115, on the contrary, we are dealing with a story, and the linguistic possibilities are therefore severely limited: only such full names as occur in the legend itself or in its historical source-material can be connected with the hypocoristic forms here recorded by the *Widsith* poet. In this material we find only one name containing the element *berht*: that of King Theodoric’s son Theodberht. The *Beccan* of *Widsith* 115 is therefore to be derived from *Theodberht*, or from the short form *Betto* of that full name. Miss Brady’s further comments (*l.c.*) show inadequate understanding of problem and method of solution.

Much the same may be said of Miss Brady’s comments on *Widsith* 5b (p. 170), 9a (p. 169), 18 (p. 149), 19 (p. 155), and 109-130 (Cap. IV, *passim*). Equally unfortunate is her attempt to read *Öðinn* into the *Hamðismál* (pp. 32-34) and even into the pages of Procopius (p. 92), ignoring the fact that *Martis dies* means Tuesday, not Wednesday. She unduly minimizes the injuries done to the text of the *Hamðismál* by the tooth of time, the damage is not “negligible” (p. 27) from any point of view. In the last syllable of the proper name *Hróðrglǫð* (*Hamðismál* 22), Miss Brady (p. 32) takes the *au* of the MS. to mean long *o*, an impossible reading: if long, the reading should be *au* (the diphthong); if short, *o*. The reading with *o* is regularly and rightly preferred, compare *Menglǫð*. Whoever *Hróðrglǫð* may be, her sex makes it impossible to identify her with *Öðinn*.

I add a few miscellaneous items. According to Miss Brady (p. 163), the *Widsith* poet wrongly represents Ermanric as a Hreðgoth. Ermanric is called *Hreðcýning* in line 7, and it is possible (though linguistically and stylistically difficult) to take this in the sense ‘king of the Hreðe,’ but the title, so taken, is in perfect agreement with history if we accept the authority of Jordanes, who gives to Ermanric an empire stretching from Baltic to Euxine. Moreover, this title does not make Ermanric a tribesman of the Hreðe, any more than the title ‘King of England’ made James I an Englishman.—The feud between Dane and Bard is not represented in the English monuments as “lasting over several generations” (p. 6); it is in Scandinavia, not in England, that the story is stretched to cover several generations.—The sword Hruting is not represented in *Beowulf* as a weapon “of supernatural origin” (p. 72).

The faults of this book, and of Miss Brady’s papers in the same field, are those of immaturity. The author has not yet lived with the old texts long enough, and does not yet know them intimately

enough. Moreover, her judgment has not yet been sharpened by long experience in research, and she overestimates the worth of debaters' points. On the other hand, she possesses valuable assets: wide reading, acquaintance with several languages, skill in composition, an independent mind, the courage to say what she thinks, willingness to work hard and long. One feels that she has in her the capacity for literary investigation, and that in due time she will produce work of permanent value.

KEMP MALONE

Chaucer's Irregular -E: A Demonstration among Monosyllabic Nouns of the Exceptions to Grammatical and Metrical Harmony. By RUTH BUCHANAN McJIMSEY. New York. King's Crown Press, 1942. Pp. x + 248 \$2.00

After having made an extensive investigation of Chaucer's use of *alms* in rhyme, together with "all the rhymes of each rhyme of each rhyme" (pp. 16-17), Miss McJimsey should have been forewarned ere she embarked upon such a complicated and difficult study as the present. The extent of the details involved, the intricacy of the problems presented, and the constant challenge to accuracy, must have called for a steadiness of control of the material such as few pieces of scholarly work may reasonably require. But students in the field will be ultimately much indebted to her patience and industry. She has taken full account of the results of earlier grammatical and metrical research, and yet she has gone over the evidence for herself in so far as it relates to monosyllabic nouns. The conclusions she has reached, of course, with a due consideration of scansion and rhyme, and her policy in this regard she has clearly stated. An example of her shrewd method may be quoted: "... whenever the pronunciation of an *-e* is not required to prevent a pause between two accented syllables, the present investigation considers no *-e* to exist in pronunciation unless some other evidence indicates that an *-e* should be pronounced. But as a matter of fact, this scansion evidence for the non-existence of *-e* is highly unsatisfactory. It is at best negative evidence" (p. 6). Again: "... the present study has worked on the basis that dissyllabic feet are normal in iambic verse and has kept a count of the cases in which *-e* is not metrically necessary. But with the possibility of trisyllabic feet admitted, it should now be clear why it is much easier to prove the pronunciation of an *-e* than to disprove it" (p. 7). "But if the scansion evidence is merely negative and the rhyme evidence is positive, then the negative evidence decreases in value . . ." (p. 12).

For convenient reference the conclusions of the study are offered in an epitome and again printed with full evidence in the pages that

follow, with a final summary of special points. The location of the lines is that of the Chaucer *Concordance*, which is based on the Globe Chaucer and convenient enough for most purposes except perhaps in the line-numbering of the *Book of the Duchess* and the *House of Fame*. The occasional use of the reading of some lines according to Robinson's edition and allusion to his notes make this arrangement a little undesirable. One hesitates to suggest, however, that both locations might have been indicated. The derivation of the words is that of the New English Dictionary. A bibliography and an index of the nouns considered (but not of other matters nor of many other words cited as evidence) are furnished at the end.

As Miss McJimsey is the first to admit, much of what she has discovered was inevitably known and understood before, such as the fact that "Many monosyllabic nouns of [Old English] feminine origin have an inorganic final *-e*" (p. vii). But she also corroborates much that has been so far largely theoretical. For example, that "In some idiomatic expressions of measure *-e* is added to monosyllabic nouns without *-e* in general usage" (p. vii). Some points of special interest emerge, such as the fact that the Old English feminines *might* and *wight* and certain others do not take an *-e*. In her summary we find also that because of the monosyllabic nouns which have a long vowel followed by a single consonant with a final unaccented *-e*, "final *-e* emerges as phonologically useful in indicating long stressed monosyllables" (p. 218) and thus, after it had survived only in writing, we may add, it so commended itself to printers for indicating a preceding long vowel. The last point offered in the book, namely that Chaucer's "language as revealed in his verse is to be cleared from the charge of archaism" (p. 219), may well be true but is somewhat dubious inasmuch as the evidence is all taken from literary sources—poetry at that.

It is no criticism of the present study to say that it raises many questions that it cannot answer. For instance, when it sets forth the principle that in rhyme "unless at least one word involved has established an independent claim through scansion to a pronounced *-e*, rhyme merely proves that words so grouped are alike with regard to *-e* . . ." (p. 12), it does not tell us clearly whether one word which has a claim to *-e* and one word which has no such claim at all may be rhymed, and what happens in such a case. Earlier it states that "adherents to the doctrine of apocope" hold that words entitled to an *-e* "always must have it pronounced in rhyme." But what, for example about the word *thing* (pp. 160 ff.) rhyming with the present participle *ymagynynq* (E 596-598)? Historically *thing* should have no *-e*,¹ and, as the evidence is printed, with no *-e* required in 374 easy scansions and nearly all the evidence here from rhyme merely negative (so Miss McJimsey mistakenly observes,

¹ But cf. the plural form in *Havelok*, 66, and *Piers Plowman*, B, vi, 212

cf. p. 14), one might infer that the *-e* is absent in both cases. But *thing* appears many times in rhyme with gerunds (e. g. A 275-276 and the evidence on pp. 160 ff.) and these occasionally rhyme with infinitives (BD, Robinson ed., 639-640 and TC iv, 239-241) or participles (A 901-902, yet cf. BD, Robinson ed., 1327-1328). Must we assume that in rhyme *-e* is added in all such cases or that it is lost?

In fact one can offer some argument to the effect that there is more evidence from rhyme that *thing* has an *-e* than that *yeer* has (cf. p. 104), which, we note, sometimes rhymes with *neer* (adv ?) and never takes an *-e* within the line. Yet the author writes of *yeer* as if it had apparently gone over entirely to the *-e* classification (p. 214) and speaks of the "confusion of *-eer* and *ere*" (p. 104). It is notable, however, that she does not put the word in the class IC ("Certain monosyllabic nouns for which there is evidence of the pronunciation of *-e*, in Chaucerian usage occur one or more times when the *-e* is not necessary in scansion," pp. 77-78). Here the need of a test of monosyllables other than nouns (e. g. *neer*, cf. BD, Robinson ed., 133-134 and 449-450), and indeed of words other than monosyllables, becomes evident. If *thing*, which sometimes rhymes with a word entitled to an *-e* and sometimes with a word that has no such claim, can have no *-e*, then it is certain, apart from other evidence, that Chaucer allowed rhymes of that type. If he did, the positive evidence of rhyme is diminished. We may ask just how often he did this, and how far the reader is warned by the first word in rhyme that such will be the case. Supplementary material is necessary for us to answer these questions, and they play a great part in the final evaluation of the evidence Miss McJimsey has put before us.

Other problems appear in the monograph but this discussion will suffice to show that the study must eventually be carried further. There are a few minor points of criticism, however, that may be added: p. vii, the extension of dative *-e* to other than petrified phrases has long been recognized and hardly furnishes a "new" category, and most of the "working of rules and exceptions in other parts of speech" has been known before (e. g. that "The infinitive *-e* is a sturdy survival"). P. 213, the statement that neuter inorganic *-e* derives from an "inflected nominative and accusative plural" is doubtful in view of the use of nouns like *dale* and *grave*, and in any case it is hard to see how the present study shows that the theory "continues to be likely." P. 218, the assumption of a doubled (more properly, lengthened) consonant in Chaucer is of doubtful validity. I note two corrections: p. 24, *Chaucerian* for *Caucerian*; p. 184, *chiere* for *cause*. As far as I have tested it, the book shows a really extraordinary degree of accuracy in reference and in presentation.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

The Art of Dying Well The Development of the Ars Moriendi. By Sister MARY CATHARINE O'CONNOR New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. xiv + 258.

Sister Mary's study of this popular book of the fifteenth century takes the following form. An Introduction discusses the nature of the work, Part I considers the question of priority between the two versions, then literary precursors and the sources, the composition of the texts, and the problem of authorship, Part II lists the MSS.; Part III treats the editions, xylographic and from movable type; Part IV describes books, contemporary and later, Catholic and post-Reformation, that were composed in the tradition of the *Ars Moriendi*.

Sister Mary makes clear that the *Ars* was intended primarily for secular readers, and conjectures that the plague may have created the need for such a work. Comparing the two versions, CP (the longer) and QS (that used in the wood-blocks), she reaches the conclusion that QS is later than, and an abridgment of, CP, with additional matter from other sources which yet improves the unity of the whole. The present reviewer finds her argument sound.

The different use made of Aristotle, *Eth Nic* 1115a (nothing is so terrible as death) plays a rôle in this argument, and Sister Mary correctly stresses the popularity of the citation. Following a method not unlike that of CP, Gianfrancesco Pico in his discourse on death (ch. 10) in *De Imaginatione* (A. D. 1500) first quotes this passage from Aristotle, and then in opposition cites Epictetus, *Ench.* 5 (death itself is nothing terrible) and St. Ambrose, *De Bono Mortis* (far from being terrible, death is to be sought; cf. 403b ff. I am surprised that this work seems not to have exerted an influence upon the *Ars Moriendi*). Aristotle's words are also cited (but attributed to St. Augustine) by the author-compiler of the so-called 'Aquinas'-tract on the art of preaching (*saec.* xv) to illustrate how the *prelocutio* of a sermon can be formed by adducing authorities in support of the *thema* (Ecclus. 41. 1: O death, how bitter is the remembrance of thee). Furthermore, Pico, like the author of CP, cites the Scriptural passage Phil. 1. 21 ff., and the author of the 'Aquinas'-tract, like the author of CP, cites Vulg. Ps. 34. 21. In both text and notes throughout her book Sister Mary supplies interesting information; if she should in the future compare the contents of the *Ars Moriendi* with material doubtless to be found in the sermons of the period, she would place us further in her debt. The aim of instruction and in particular the method of interrogation employed in the *Ars Moriendi* alone suggest a close analogy with preaching.

Sutton's *Disce Mori* (p. 200 of Sister Mary's book) proclaims the art of dying as superior to any of the liberal arts. Compare the introductory poem addressed to William of Auvergne in a fifteenth-

century copy (Paris, Bibl. Nat. Rés. D 15239 = Hain-Copinger 8305) of his *Rhetorica Divina*, a rhetoric of prayer. Vain was the instruction of the rhetoricians, who 'taught only to move the heart of a human judge, whereas our lofty art teaches how to mollify the just wrath of that Great Judge, even God'. To express the high esteem in which some of the authors (e.g., pp. 177, 205) hold the art of dying, they employ the same term—'the art of arts' or 'the science of sciences'—as St. Gregory, *Reg. Past.* ch. 1, uses for the art of governing souls (pastoral teaching), and the author of the 'Aquinas'-tract for preaching. In like fashion Boncampagno and Mino da Colle regard *dictamen* as 'empress' of the liberal arts, or as 'queen' of the sciences.

In order to discover the sources (the most important source was the section in Gerson's *Opus Tripartitum* which treats of dying) Sister Mary studies the texts carefully, and her speculations on how these were composed appear valid. We learn that the *Ars* could not have been written before 1408, that it was composed in the vicinity of Constance, and perhaps at the time when the Council was held there. The evidence, in great part external, leads Sister Mary to believe that the author, who remains *incertus*, was probably a Dominican.

Well over three hundred MS. copies of the *Ars*, in Latin and a number of vernacular tongues, are listed, one MS., at Karlsruhe, is dated as early as 1431. Information obtained from catalogues Sister Mary occasionally supplemented with data acquired from librarians and from the study of photographs. She is aware that there must exist many copies of which she has no knowledge, and her caution is just, for many collections in Europe have not been catalogued, many catalogues have not been published, some have been published only in incomplete form (e.g., that of Melk, and I would hazard the guess that the Monastery library still contains some at least of those copies she misses from the mediaeval catalogue; see her p. 70 and n. 59), and it is always well to remind the reader that many of the published catalogues contain a great number of errors and omissions. To Sister Mary's list I would add three copies of CP: Paris, Mazarine MS. 970 (*saec.* xv). 1 ff.; Rome, Vatican, Palat. Lat. MS. 676 (xv). 84 ff. and MS. 719 (xv). 44 ff.

The editions (these exceed forty in number) are considered in some detail, and in their relation to the MSS. I may correct Sister Mary on one item: the colophon of the facsimile (1905) of the edition in Catalan reads Valencia, 1491?, not 1481? (see p. 163 and n. 358 in Sister Mary's book). Palau, *Manual* 1. 121, accords with Haebler's earlier assignment of this edition to Joan Rosenbach (not Rosenberg), Barcelona, c. 1403.

Sister Mary's list of books composed in the tradition of the *Ars Moriendi* was not intended to be exhaustive. She is, and fairly enough, content here to deal with a goodly number of representative

works, mostly English, and leaves to others the task of investigating thoroughly the subject of influence. I would call to the attention of such investigators three works by Jesuits which are listed in Sommervogel's *Dictionnaire* Bouchy's *L'art de bien mourir, etc* (Liège, 1635), Hevenesi's *Ars bonae mortis, etc* (Vienna, 1695), and Trigona's *Arte di ben morire, etc* (Palermo, 1735). And my colleague, Dr. H. H. King, refers me to the copy of the Portuguese *Arte deuota e douta pera bem morrer* by Dom Damião da Cruz in Coimbra Univ. MS 1800-1801 2. 57 ff.

A few notes on minor points p. 86, n. 130 repeats what is said at the top of p. 87, Antwerp (so on p. 182) appears as *Anvers* on p. 183; misprints p. 93, par 2 *been* for *seen*, p. 98 *Amrosian*, p. 245 *Guiseppe*, p. 78, n. 89 *asetischen*, faulty Greek accents on pp. 11 and 239. Finally, and with all respect for the author of a useful book, the present reviewer cannot praise locutions like *a how-to-die chapter* (p. 19), *the later holy-dying literature* (p. 172), or *the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge edition* (p. 199, n. 198).

HARRY CAPLAN

Cornell University

The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor. By GRACE EDNA MOORE (University of Pennsylvania A Dissertation in English), Philadelphia, 1942. Pp. xci + 142.

The appearance of Miss Moore's dissertation reminds us once more how much remains to be done in the gathering and careful editing of the Middle English saints' legends. Nearly a hundred years have passed since Thorpe's edition of Aelfric's *Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, which contains a number of legends of the saints, and which has long since become a scarce item. The editing of the Old English texts of hagiological context was carried on well nigh to completion in the last years of the last century by Wanley, Earle, Skeat, and others. The relative paucity of manuscripts made this possible. A like service for the Middle English legends has not yet been rendered. The valuable and fairly comprehensive labors of Carl Horstman gave the first considerable impetus to the business of unearthing and of presenting a cross-section of the material extant. The amount of Horstman's publication of legends is really astonishing, but the quality is extremely uneven. He strove to present at least one version of each legend in the successive issues of his *Altenglische Legenden* (1875, 1878, and 1881).¹ Subsequently, the Middle English legends were

¹ See also his publication of the *Scottish Saints, Osbern Bokenam's Lives of Saints, Nova Legenda Angliae, etc.* The last named is the handiest source for the best known of the Latin versions of English legends.

studied sporadically by various scholars in this country and abroad. An indication of the amount of careful work which still needs to be done may be seen in Miss Moore's model presentation of the St. Edward the Confessor legend. An equally careful consideration needs to be applied to a number of other Middle English legends which still remain in numerous manuscripts. As evidence of the extent of various versions of any one legend may be cited H. R. Luard's *Lives of Edward the Confessor* (Rolls Series, London, 1858), where are printed an Old French and two Latin versions of the life of the pious king. Miss Moore discusses the relationship and kinds of material dealing with the monarch, particularly the controversial attitudes of the French and the English towards the king. Some attention is given to the life-records in various of the more popular chronicles. Miss Moore does not pretend to completeness in her list but a mention of an Icelandic *Játvarthar Saga* (See Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, xi, 327) would be of interest to students of the subject. The avenues of English Hagiology in Icelandic have been little explored.

In her appendix, Miss Moore prints for the first time the Middle English Prose Lives of this saint. The carefulness of Miss Moore's work is to be commended. Two misprints (p x and p xliii n) might have been avoided. A topical index to all parts of the volume would be a convenient addition.

C. GRANT LOOMIS

University of California (Berkeley)

The Earliest English Poetry. By CHARLES W. KENNEDY. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1943. Pp viii + 375. \$3.

This history is described on the title-page as "a critical survey of the poetry written before the Norman conquest." It is well written and abounds in good things e.g. the treatment of the so-called storm riddles (pp. 140-145, 364-368). Unluckily, however, it suffers from serious deficiencies, and therefore cannot be given unqualified commendation. Graduate students and others professionally interested in OE will look for an index, but in vain, and they will find the "selected bibliography" of seven pages not only too short but also overloaded with lumber. Sec. V in particular includes some worthless and some out-of-date items—a serious matter when the total number of items is only 28. A work of 375 pages on OE poetry ought to take up all the extant poems, but the author has left out the metrical psalms and the meters of Alfred's *Boethius*. In other words, the whole of vol. v of the Krapp-Dobbie corpus. I find no discussion of the *Menologium* either, and various other poems of no great importance are passed over in silence. Of

these, the recently discovered *Stanzarc Poem* (text in Krapp-Dobbie vi 98-104) might at least have been mentioned. In the appendix on the MSS (pp. 353-361) we get no description of CCCC 201 or Cotton Tib. B 1, and no mention of the Paris Psalter or Cotton Otho A vi, though all four of these MSS include a good deal of OE verse. Here however the author follows a widespread practice, even the Cambridge Bibliography lists only four instead of eight MSS under "Chief MS Sources of Poetry" (i 62-63).

Space permits only the following comments on slips of the pen and details about which reviewer and author disagree. It is hardly right to call Cædmon a convert (p. 16). I cannot accept the generalization that "there was little room for the trivial or frivolous in OE life or letters" (p. 21), although our scanty records, made by monks, certainly include little that the scribes thought of as trivial or frivolous. The author might have translated the first Ealhild passage of *Widsith* differently (p. 25) if he had consulted F. Klaeber, in *Studia Germanica iullagnade E. A. Kock*, pp. 113-114. The third section of *Deor* has no connection with the Weland story (p. 31), see my paper in *MP* XL 1-18. For my identification of the Theodric of *Deor* the reader should be referred, not to the necessarily summary discussion in my edition of *Deor* (note 19, p. 33), but to the fuller treatment of the matter in *Acta Phil. Scand.* IX 76-84. There is no reason to think that at the end of the Finnsburg fragment the scene shifts from Danes to Frisians (p. 43). Certain Icelandic parallels to the fight with Grendel and his mother undoubtedly localize the fighting, or part of it, behind a waterfall (pp. 69 ff.), but we have no reason to think this localization primitive, it is more plausibly explained as a rationalization of the originally supernatural (hellish) setting. The prophecy attributed to Beowulf (p. 81) is too precise to hold water as prophecy; see my discussion in *JEGP* XXXIX 76-92. If Lotharus is to be mentioned at all in a history of OE poetry, a footnote referring to my paper on him in *Acta Phil. Scand.* XIII 201-214 ought to be given (p. 83), but it would be better to leave him out altogether. The author attaches undue weight to Miss Hotchner's dissertation (p. 106). Miss Kershaw, now Mrs. Chadwick, should be referred to by a feminine pronoun (note 45, p. 124). The opening passage of the second gnomic poem in the Exeter Book is misinterpreted (p. 148); see a paper of mine forthcoming in *Medium Ævum*. In all likelihood the *Dream of the Rood* was composed long before Cynewulf's day (p. 261). The author is surely wrong in divorcing *The Grave* from the poetic type in which the soul addresses its dead body (p. 330).

KEMP MALONF

Stolne and Surreptitious Copies, A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos. By ALFRED HART Melbourne, Victoria. Melbourne University Press, London. Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 478. 12s 6d

The desideratum today is a comprehensive study which will establish the genus of bad quartos by fully investigating each corrupt text and comparing it with its fellows. The book under review is not such a study.

Hart deals only with the bad quartos of Shakespeare. Of these he concerns himself only with the corrupt versions of 2, 3 *H VI*, *HV*, *Hamlet*, *MWofW*, and *R&J*. The omission of *Pericles* one can perhaps understand, there is no corresponding good text. But his not investigating the quartos of *Richard III* and *King Lear* is surprising. D. L. Patrick's book on *Richard III* came out in 1936. Greg's famous *Neophilologus* article on *King Lear* came out in 1933. In 1930 Chambers in his authoritative *William Shakespeare. A Study of Facts and Problems* had already indicated he thought *Q KL* a bad quarto, and Hart refers to this book. The point is not alone that Hart's title is a misnomer. The greater point is that Hart either through incomplete investigation or through failure to read available scholarship has omitted from consideration the very two Shakespeare bad quartos which disprove his central hypothesis: "My thesis is to prove that each bad quarto is a garbled abridgment of an acting version made officially by the play adapter of the company from Shakespeare's manuscript, my aim throughout has been to make even destructive criticism lend some support to this central truth" (p. 437).

This thesis rests on a series of articles which Hart published in *RES* in 1932 and 1934 (VIII, 139-54, 395-413, x, 1-28). Their strict burden was that the time length for the performance of an Elizabethan play was two hours, the line length being 2300 to 2400 lines. However, the only exact evidence which we possess concerning the length of Elizabethan performance is comprised in the extant promptbooks which give unassailable evidence of having been used in the theatre for actual performance. In his 1934 article (p. 3) Hart has a statistical table dealing with these MSS. He arrives at an average length of 2358 lines. Of Hart's sixteen, Greg in *Elizabethan Dramatic Documents* allows only twelve into his group of promptbooks which show evidence of actual theatrical use. According to Hart's numbering, in these twelve *I Richard II* has the greatest length (2830 lines) and *John a Kent* has the shortest (1638 lines). Of the twelve, five are above 2500 lines and two are below 2000. Surely, casting an average here is useless. All that we can say is that sometimes an Elizabethan performance could be 2800 lines (or longer) or 1600 lines (or shorter).

But Hart's particular hypothesis in the book under review—that the Shakespeare bad quartos are reports of the good versions abridged to around 2300 lines for performance—is automatically invalidated when we include Qq of *RIII* and *KL* among the stolne and surreptitious texts. The Q length of *RIII* is 3389 lines (F is 3570). The Q length of *KL* is 3092 lines (F is 2899). No, it is not abridgment which lies behind the shortness of most of the bad versions. It is faulty memorizing. Until we have exhausted the memorial reconstruction hypothesis, we should not look elsewhere for an explanation of the various differences between good and bad versions. When Greg points to purposive abridgment in *Orlando Furioso*, we can point to "telescoping," the memory's skipping from one line to a further line because of similar phraseology or theme. When Schucking points to purposive stage adaptation to account for the different position of scenes in QI of *Hamlet*, we can point to gross memorial confusion (see "The Sequence of Scenes in *Hamlet*," *MLN*, LV [1940], 382-87).

Not alone is Hart's main thesis wrong, but this supposedly comprehensive monograph on the Shakespeare bad quartos, 478 pages long, adds little to what we already know of their corruption. A crying need is a study of the bad quarto of *HV* as a memorial reconstruction, Hart gives very little space to the matter. He does not even notice the important problem of bibliographical links between good and bad versions. His chapter, "Emendations of Shakespeare's Text from the Bad Quartos," hardly begins to scratch the surface. His many pages on "echoes" in the bad quartos of passages from other plays (pp 352-402) are completely indiscriminating. Hart's section on the faulty meter in the bad quartos serves no purpose. Chapters III through VI show by statistical tables that the relationship between a bad text and its good text in the matter of vocabulary is not like the relationship between a source play and Shakespeare's resultant play. This is intended to confute those who believe that Shakespeare rewrote the bad text into the good text. But who today believes this? Throughout the book, spreading confusion in all directions, is Hart's thesis that the bad quartos represent abridgments.

Concomitant with this thesis is Hart's belief that the bad quartos are reports reconstructed from memory of performance by pirate actors. At the 1937 meeting of the M. L. A., in a paper entitled "A Proposed Solution to the Problem of the Bad Quartos," this reviewer suggested that a bad quarto was created by a reporter's memorizing from a theatrical MS. Mnemonic phenomena which adumbrate a single memory, stage-directions which are like those of the promptbooks, patches of correctly lined blank verse; small patches of perfect reproduction in the midst of wild confusion; isolated bibliographical links of spelling, punctuation, capitalization between the good and bad texts of *HV*, *IIHV*, *MWofW*,

Hamlet—these show us a reporter imperfectly remembering what he has seen on the written page. No other theory accounts for all the phenomena which make up a bad quarto. The Admiral's men had to pay two pounds "to stay the printing" of *Patient Grissill* on March 18, 1600, only a few weeks after the play was first produced. The only probable explanation would seem to be that a stationer was preparing to print a bad quarto created according to the hypothesis outlined above. At the end of *Edward I* we find, 'Yours By George Peele, Maister of Artes in Oxenford' The preface to the Malone Society reprint (1911) reads "The authorship is attested in the printed editions by a curious colophon evidently copied from the manuscript."—Rather memorized from the manuscript, for *Edward I* is a bad quarto.

LEO KIRSCHBAUM

St Louis University

The Globe Playhouse: Its Design and Equipment. By JOHN CRANFORD ADAMS. Cambridge. Harvard University Press, 1942. Pp. xiv + 420. \$5.00.

This study of the Globe Playhouse follows close upon G. F. Reynolds' monograph on another theater of the same period, *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater, 1605-1625*, though Mr Adams' work was apparently in press before the appearance of Mr. Reynolds' book in 1940. The two studies are notably different in method. Mr. Reynolds, limiting his inquiry to plays for which we have evidence of performance at the Red Bull and interpreting his findings with utmost caution, concluded that very few details of the structure of the Red Bull stage could be determined with any certainty. Even the existence of an inner (alcove) stage could not be demonstrated, simultaneous staging and similar devices of medieval theatrical technique would suffice for presenting scenes in Red Bull plays which we usually assign to the inner stage.

Mr. Adams does not share the conservatism which made Mr. Reynolds' results seem disappointingly inconclusive to students of the Elizabethan drama. On the contrary, by gathering up all the shreds of available evidence and piecing them together by ingenious conjecture, Mr. Adams reconstructs the Globe Playhouse and its equipment down to the last detail and dimension.¹ The cogency of

¹ One of Mr. Adams' chief arguments for the exact dimensions he assigns to the Globe is based on the width of the stage (43 ft.) specified in the Fortune contract, which he maintains (p. 22 and elsewhere) would be an arbitrary width in a rectangular playhouse. But suppose the octagonal Globe was designed with two 12-ft. bays to each of the eight sides, and the platform stage extended from the middle post of one side to the middle post

his arguments varies with the different points he seeks to establish. He is wholly convincing, for example, on the octagonal shape of the Globe, the position of the "gentlemen's rooms," and the location of the main trap. On other matters his case is less persuasive, on still others it has merely a thin tissue of conjecture to support it. In citing stage directions as evidence, Mr. Adams, unlike Mr. Reynolds, draws upon the whole body of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama without establishing the date of the extant text of each play cited or determining whether the play was written for the Globe. His justification is the belief that all public playhouses of the early seventeenth century were "essentially uniform" in design (p. 356), and that the structural details of the second Globe reproduced those of the first—assumptions that are debatable, as the differing descriptions of the staging of Heywood's *Red Bull* play *The Silver Age* given by Mr. Adams and Mr. Reynolds clearly demonstrate.

To examine critically the evidence for any single feature of Mr. Adams' conjectural reconstruction of the Globe demands the space of an article rather than a review. The vague hints provided by stage directions and contemporary references are often susceptible to two or more interpretations. But, now that Mr. Adams has presented a coherent picture including every feature of the design of the Globe instead of the piece-meal descriptions we have had in the past, those who defend alternative explanations of the scant evidence will need to make sure that their theories are equally consonant with a workable reconstruction of the whole. For Mr. Adams offers us a practicable theater of great flexibility, consisting of at least five different stages that were part of the playhouse structure: the outer stage, the inner stage or "study"; the "chamber" above, at the second level of the tiring-house, the window stages flanking the "chamber"; and the music room at the third level of the tiring-house. He believes that when the Lord Chamberlain's Men built their playhouse in 1599 they incorporated in its design every device that past experience had suggested as theatrically useful, and he demonstrates how these devices would lend themselves to strikingly effective staging of Elizabethan plays. He exhibits a keen awareness of the materials and methods of construction available to the sixteenth-century architect, and makes clear that the Globe he pictures solved its structural problems in strict accord with contemporary practice.

We may wonder whether the Elizabethans were as ingenious as

of the next side but one. Then, says Mr. Adams, the width of the Globe stage would be exactly 43 ft. The *Fortune* presumably copied this width without the structural reason for it. Here, however, an error in mathematics destroys the value of the argument; under the given assumptions the width of the Globe stage works out to just under 41 ft. instead of 43 ft. [24 ft. plus twice the side of a 45 degree triangle whose hypotenuse is 12 ft.]

the modern student in perceiving all the theatrical possibilities latent in their playhouse structure. Thus we may remain uncertain whether the Globe described in this book corresponds precisely to the Globe of Shakespeare's company. Nevertheless, Mr Adams' Globe Playhouse is certainly a highly workable theater, built within the limitations imposed upon the Elizabethan carpenter by his materials. It represents what the ideal public playhouse of Shakespeare's age might possibly have been.

FRANCIS R. JOHNSON

Stanford University

The Letters of John Dryden with Letters Addressed to Him. Collected and edited by CHARLES E. WARD. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1942. Pp. xviii + 196. \$3.00.

Defoe's Sources for Robert Drury's Journal. By JOHN ROBERT MOORE. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Publications, 1943. Pp. 87. \$.75. (Humanities Series No. 9.)

Mr. Ward's is the first attempt to assemble and edit Dryden's letters since that of Edmond Malone in 1800. But devoted and competent research over a period of years has repaid Mr. Ward with small returns, for there are assembled here but seventy-seven letters in all, sixty-two of them written by Dryden and fifteen addressed to him by various correspondents. Indeed, during the century and a half since Malone's book appeared—*The Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John Dryden*—there have been brought to light and printed only seventeen new letters by Dryden. One of these is the find of Mr. Ward (from the collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania), No. 5 of the present edition, which he believes to be addressed to Viscount Latimer in 1677—the year when *All for Love* was produced. He also prints for the first time the full text of five letters by William Walsh and thus fills out the important Dryden-Walsh run. But to estimate the contribution of the volume in these terms is misleading. It is a service of value to bring the letters together, to establish accurate texts by reference to the originals (half of which are in this country), to date them, to identify correspondents, and to furnish explanatory notes.

It is also a good office to give Dryden a chance to speak without interruption. In these pages one feels close to the man in his latter years—honest ("dissembling, though lawfull in some Cases, is not my talent"), resolutely forthright, a little sour, always taking life hard. One understands better the human side of an austere poet from his own accounts of the staging of his plays, of his excursions into his native Northamptonshire "to unweary my selfe, after my studies" or "to drudge for the winter"; of his great translating

venture—"I have undertaken to translate all Virgil" One is touched and impressed by his allegiance, to the very end, to the Jacobite cause and the Catholic religion. "I can never go an Inch beyond my Conscience & my Honour. . . . I can neither take the oathes, nor forsake my Religion . . . not being capable of renouncing the Cause, for which I have so long Sufferd" Many of the letters are written, as he says, "without poetry, from the bot-tome of my Heart" All are of one piece whether addressed to his literary friends and patrons, his publisher Tonson, his dear sons, Pepys ("Padron Mio"), honored Dr Busby, or his kinswoman, Elizabeth Stewart of Cotterstock

But this reviewer, at least, does not agree with Mr. Ward that these personal letters "form almost the only real source for a study of the man" For the many dedications, that is the public letters addressed to Dorset, Leveson-Gower, Sedley, Congreve, et al—which, it may be, should have had a place in this book—are documents rich in the personal details needed for a biographical study. Although another serious biography seems not now to be justified, until that time this edition of his letters should take its place on the shelf of indispensables with Hugh Macdonald's *Bibliography* (1939) and James Osborn's *Biographical Facts and Problems* (1940).

The title *Madagascar or Robert Drury's Journal . . . Written by Himself* (1729) was queried in Trent's bibliography of Defoe in the CBEL. In the CBEL, it was included by H. C. Hutchins among the authenticated works. In the meantime the idea—tossed about for many years—was taking shape that this book, the most valuable English work on Madagascar, was not the record of one man's actual experience but was a characteristic travel romance by the author of *Robinson Crusoe*. The case for Defoe's authorship was first supported with documented statements of his style, method, and ideas by J. R. Moore in *Defoe in the Pillory and Other Studies* (1939). Mr. Moore, in this recent brochure, expands and illustrates his argument and explores the possible sources of the *Journal*.

He has acquired several new slants since the earlier work for example, he now believes that although the *Journal* is probably based chiefly on printed sources, there is less dependence upon Flacourt and Ogilby, that there is discernible a marked reliance upon the oral communication of voyagers, among them possibly Madagascar ex-pirates, and that fictitious though the framework is, there is much factual realism in the account of the island. The possible sources, considered with minute attention, are John Benbow's lost manuscript journal, Robert Knox's *Ceylon*, together with his conversation and his unpublished autobiographical manuscript; Robert Everard's *Relation*, *Atlas Geographus* and similar works derived from Flacourt; information secured through oral trans-

mission and untraced manuscripts, and Defoe's own previously expressed knowledge of Madagascar. The appended word list and map are studied in their relation to the *Journal*. Throughout, the implication is that the last thing may not yet have been said.

The analysis is presented with explicitness—and with gusto. Mr. Moore is an enthusiast for the Drury kind of tale and for Drury's creator, "the elderly literary gentleman in his famous study at Stoke Newington."

RAE BLANCHARD

Goucher College

The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope. Edited by JOHN BUTT. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942. Vol. II, *The Rape of the Lock and Other Poems*, ed. GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. Pp. xx + 410. Vol. IV, *Imitations of Horace with An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot and The Epilogue to the Satires*, ed. JOHN BUTT. Pp. lv + 406. \$4.00 each.

These two volumes are the first installment of a new six-volume edition of Pope's poetical works, excluding the translation of Homer, executed on such a scale that it should supersede the Elwin-Courthope. It is to be hoped that the distribution of the task among several editors will make possible an early completion of the whole work. Pope has suffered more than any other English poet from a succession of unsympathetic editors, and even the Elwin-Courthope edition, which has long been standard, suffers from the incongruity of two different critical attitudes as well as from its now antiquated scholarship. This new edition not only incorporates a considerable mass of new information which has accumulated during the last fifty years, but also reflects the changed tone of modern discussion of Pope, both as man and as poet.

Although much of the annotation and commentary must of course resume the accumulations of the past editors, even a casual examination of these volumes will reveal extensive and important new additions. One notes, for instance, frequent significant references to such new sources as the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Along with the text of *The Fourth Satire of Dr. John Donne* we have on opposite pages its scarce first form, *The Impertinent*. Pope's original version of the *Second Satire of Dr. Donne* is printed for the first time from a manuscript volume of poems in the British Museum. Courthope is corrected on his ingenious assumption that Warburton, not Pope, devised the titles *Prologue to the Satires* and *Epilogue to the Satires*. The discussion of Pope's relations with Addison conforms with the recently discovered evidence. The publications by such Pope specialists as R. H. Griffith and George Sherburn have obviously

made a heavy contribution of new material, but the editors have also been industrious and painstaking in their own researches. An edition which represents such an advance must be regarded as indispensable.

Mr Tillotson's commentary on Pope's earlier poems is especially refreshing and illuminating. The modernizations of Chaucer are discussed against a background of the history of Chaucer's interpretation. Instead of speculations regarding the biographical significance of *Elissa to Abelard* and the *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*, we have an account of the relation of these poems to the literary traditions of the heroic epistle and the elegy. As readers of Mr. Tillotson's recent volume on the poetry of Pope might expect, his commentary gives an abundance of parallels from Pope's predecessors. Such search for parallels can no doubt be overdone, but Mr. Tillotson nevertheless guides us in the right direction when he says that Pope "was original because he crowded into his poem the best of everything that had already been achieved and heightened it to a new best" (p. 288).

Some readers may question the policy of printing the first, rather than the last, text authorized by the poet, with his revisions given as variants at the bottom of the page. It also seems regrettable that references to Pope's letters should be given, not by date, but by volume and page to the Elwin-Courthope edition, as though this edition were to continue standard indefinitely. But such reservations are of minor importance when weighed against the substantial merits of this important publication.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

The Art of Letter Writing. An Essay on the Handbooks Published in England during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

By JEAN ROBERTSON. Liverpool. University Press of Liverpool, 1942. Pp. 80. 7s. 6d.

The continued and conscientious issuance of scholarly books from British presses furnishes double gratification to the American reviewer, both as evidence that liberal studies can be produced in a country far more hard put to it by war than his own is ever likely to be, and as un hoped-for contribution to his own field. Miss Robertson has carefully explored a little dusty corner of the forgotten guides to daily conduct of these centuries. She divides her material into well defined types, each dominating a particular period, traces the influence of each type beyond its heyday, and the change into something else, with accompanying, well selected illustrations; and furnishes a bibliography of these works from 1586-1700, which is considerably extended at both ends by refer-

ences in the text and the annotations. She also pauses to suggest the social significance of these changing models for letter writers and their continental sources and connections. I should have recommended two additional comments. The typical sixteenth century handbook was intended not only for the scholar, as she points out, but for the gentleman as well. As for the English "Secretaries," the use of the epistolary art in a public capacity seems not to have interested the English this century as it did the Italians, who wrote "Secretaries" for the guidance of courtiers serving their lords in that office. The second part of Day's "The English Secretorie," published first in the second edition (1592), contains a section entitled, "Of the parts, place, and office of a secretorie," which would seem to be the only exception.

The illustrative letters are highly suggestive of the value of these handbooks for students of social customs. I. P.'s letter in "Cupid's Messenger" (1629), "To his mistress (quondam) having spent all his meanes upon her in prosperitie, he being imprisoned she forsakes him," is in the very best vein of vituperation used by calumniators of women from Matheolus on. Gainsford's letter in "The Secretories Studie" (1616) on "Whether a Gentlewoman may with her credit, let out lodgings for money" recalls the question Edmond Bolton tried to settle in his "Cities Advocate" (written about the same time), whether a gentleman's son apprenticed to a trade lost his gentility. Bolton stoutly maintained that he did not and might therefore challenge any gentleman, however unapprenticed, to a duel. The gentleman, as usual, is bound by severer restrictions if she would maintain her gentility. The answer is no for "A Gentlewoman, whether widdow or wife, living in the freedome of reputation, is not to be servile in any thing, nor to bedurtie herselfe with the dregges of any covetousnesse, or sinister practises against her credite."

Miss Robertson's compact account is to be welcomed, for, to my mind, the existence of an earlier study of the English letter writer, evidently unknown to her, does not destroy its usefulness. Miss Katherine Gee Hornbeak in "The Complete Letter Writer in English 1568-1800," published in 1934 (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol 15), had already surveyed the same material at greater length with essentially the same results for the period in which the two coincide. For its much greater amount of analysis, illustration and comparison of many of the examples her study is to be preferred by anyone interested especially in the books themselves (particularly if inaccessible), and also by anyone viewing letter writers as a part of the development of the novel, Miss Hornbeak's own interest. Miss Robertson, on the other hand, gives a clearer, more easily grasped account of the whole course of letter writers in England for her two centuries since she can begin with the early Latin formularies and Erasmus's all pervading pattern, and can fit everything into place without resort to footnote

and appendix additions. Her bibliography is far more usable organized alphabetically by authors than the other which lists the titles of both new books and new editions under the year of publication, and it contains some twenty more items. This recent essay is likely to prove more accessible to students, appearing as a distinct work. Publication in a college series unfortunately is almost tantamount to burial—cataloguing fashions being what they are, and the English scholar can readily be forgiven for not having run across the American work. Any balance against her is at least partly restored by Miss Hornbeak's having missed the fact recorded by Miss Robertson that R. B. McKerrow had already established the source of Fullwood's "The Enemie of Idlenesse" (*Gentleman's Magazine*, May, 1906).

RUTH KELSO

The University of Illinois

A Preface to Paradise Lost By C. S. LEWIS London and New York. Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. viii + 139. \$2.25.

Poets and Their Critics Langland and Milton Warton Lecture on English Poetry, 1941. By R. W. CHAMBERS. [Reprinted from the Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. XXVII.] London: Humphrey Milford, [1941]. Pp. 48. \$1.25.

Mr. Lewis has written a book that answers a real need. Here at last, for teacher and student, is an introduction to the reading of *Paradise Lost* which is brief, helpful, entertaining, and stimulating. It contains no chart of Milton's cosmology, no complicated researches into Milton's sources, no subtle interpretations of Milton's meaning, and no sales talk on Milton's sublimity. Instead, with wit and common sense it examines the principal difficulties which confront the modern reader, explains how these may be surmounted (not avoided!), and points the way to both understanding and enjoyment. The *Preface to Paradise Lost* is an excellent book to put into the hands of intelligent students, for it will jolt them, amuse them, and clear their heads of a good many misconceptions, not only about Milton, but also about the older poetry in general. It will do their elders no harm, either.

Lewis's method is to strip a problem to teasingly simple fundamentals, illuminate those fundamentals with a colorful analogy or two, and then demand that the reader make his choice. Not every reader will accept Lewis's alternatives, but all should find it invigorating to watch him present them. His book is really more than an exposition of *Paradise Lost*, it is also an eloquent defence of the rôle of ritual and "stock responses" and "civility" in human

life. But chiefly Lewis pleads that twentieth century readers make an effort to achieve seventeenth century attitudes, taking Milton as he meant to be taken. To appreciate *Paradise Lost* as a work of art, one must imaginatively recover a lost attitude toward epic. To appreciate the epic's meaning, one must recover a lost attitude toward theology and pneumatology and hierarchy. Lewis shows how, with occasional remarks on the mistaken notions of Eliot, Saurat, Tillyard, and others.

Some American scholars will resent the way in which American scholarship is totally ignored in the book, especially since the author advertises that he and Mr. Charles Williams have found "a true critical attitude after more than a hundred years of laborious misunderstanding." In the realms of gold Mr. Lewis imagines himself a stouter and more vocal Cortez—the wrong man at the right place. But only those who prefer history to poetic experience will cry "Balboa!", for his words have a high specific gravity when measured against much that passes for Milton criticism today.

The late R. W. Chambers knew well the backbiting poverty of some of that criticism, and in his Warton Lecture of 1941 he summoned scholarship and common sense to provide a pauper's burial for the "Lower Biography" as represented by the *Studies* of S. B. Liljegren. *Poets and Their Critics* is a spirited attack upon views which impede our understanding of "the great tradition of fortitude in English poetry," and it urges us to say a decisive "Yes" or "No" to a complexity of theories which we have hitherto tolerated as "interesting." After saying "No" to the theory of the multiple authorship of *Piers Plowman*, Chambers gives an equally emphatic negative to the recent detractors of Milton's sincerity and honor. Particularly valuable is an eleven-page note on "the 'Pamela-prayer,' and other alleged frauds of Milton," in which Liljegren's well known accusations are pronounced—and conclusively proved—"inane." The whole unfortunate matter may now be forgotten.

WILLIAM R. PARKER

Ohio State University

London in Flames, London in Glory. By R. A. AUBIN. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1943. Pp. xvi + 383. \$4.50.

Mr. Aubin has collected a group of poems concerned with the fire and rebuilding of London in the seventeenth century and issues them at a time when the old city's life is again threatened and her sons once more need courage for present and future. The poems, it must be confessed, are more curious than exciting. The editor is

abundantly aware that he needs the type of benevolent reader who, as he says himself, will accept pieces of this sort in the spirit voiced by Lord Palmerston when he was offered the Order of the Garter: "Splendid! There's no d—d merit in it!" Most of these city poets must have belonged to Elkanah Settle's breed, and their metrical lucubrations are for the most part dull and spiritless refashionings of the expected Deprecation of God's judgments figures largely in most of them, along with accounts of the progress of the fire, charges against the Dutch and Jesuits, similes involving Sodom, Rome, and that wretched bird the Phoenix, astonishing conceits like the one about good Eliza in stone on the outside arch of the burning prison casting her eye on Whitehall,

But when she saw her *Palace* safe, her fears
Vanish, one Eye drops *smiles*, the other *tears*

The Jeremiads try so hard to be impressive, and too often succeed in being merely ridiculous.

'Wake sottish *Island*! let thy ruins teach
Thy Sons and Daughters to bewail the *Breach*.
Where are thy *Noahs*, *Daniels* and *Jobs*?
Are these the men, that in their linsie *Robes*
Chant their Devotions? th' Angels of the *Quire*,
Whose very *Noses* threat their *shirts* with fire;
Whose *Bacchanalian* zeal's a flame they stole
Not from the *Altar*, but *Mæonian* coal
Are these the men, that with their *Pipes* can do
The *Counter-wonder* on a *Jericho*?

Apparently even the four Horsemen of the Apocalypse could not frighten the Londoner of that day out of his beer. Gluttony was the sin, as the wooden statue of the fat boy on Pie Corner used to tell us, or was it stage-plays, or our neglect in not returning gratitude and obedience to God for "that wonderful and merciful Restauration" of Charles II? "God did blow the coal."

When the Salamander-Muse, as Simon Ford calls his "poor Girl," turns from the burning to the rebuilding of London, the themes become at least more varied. Metrical language does occasionally in these poems what it should do; it narrows the shutter and gives us more clearly defined pictures. The meters vary from the humble fourteenner to the top-lofty Pindaric, and practically every bad literary fashion of the time is exemplified.

The poems are edited with scrupulous care. The notes are both explanatory and illustrative, and never, I think, irrelevant. They will keep some readers awake who may perchance grow drowsy over the verses.

WILLIAM HENRY IRVING

Duke University

The Later Career of Tobias Smollett By LOUIS L. MARTZ. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. Pp viii + 213. \$3 00 (Yale Studies in English, 97)

Dr. Martz's theme is threefold (a) Smollett's style changed considerably between 1753 and 1771, (b) this was primarily due to the novelist's extensive "historical" writings, and (c) such labors were typical of the mid-century, which was an "age of synthesis." The volume includes an introductory survey of some intellectual trends in the eighteenth century and of Smollett's career; contains a detailed investigation of the *Compendium of Voyages*, as well as an examination of the *Travels, Adventures of an Atom* and the *Present State of all Nations*, and is concluded by an attempt to evaluate the effect of Smollett's work and interests during this period on the style and content of his later works, particularly *Humphrey Clinker*.

The chief value of this study is its analytical evaluation of the *Compendium* and the *Present State*, which have received slight attention heretofore. Also meritorious are the considerations of style and sources of the *Travels* and *Adventures of an Atom*, and of *Humphrey Clinker* itself, upon which Dr. Martz rightly focuses his attention. Scholars have long been aware of the general literary phenomena which form Dr. Martz's point of departure, but Smollett's work has not hitherto been used extensively as a case history, nor has the *Present State* been examined in any detail as contributing to the general movement or to the change in Smollett's own style. An estimate of the exact indebtedness of the *Travels* and *Humphrey Clinker* to popular guide books and travels is another of Dr. Martz's accomplishments.

At times, Dr. Martz falls into the common error of accepting his own hypotheses as facts. Further, he seems to me to underestimate the effects of Smollett's medical training, as well as his work for the *Critical Review*, *Complete History of England*, and the *Modern Part of the Universal History*. Dr. Martz mentions all these, but briefly, although their combined value in any estimate of Smollett's later work is considerable. *The Later Career* is, however, a significant contribution to Smollett scholarship and provides others interested in Smollett with many leads for future work. It is hoped, however, that Miss Norwood's Smollett Bibliography and Professor Knapp's Life of Smollett will be available to future scholars intending to treat the novelist in any considerable detail.

CLAUDE E. JONES

Headquarters, 11ND,
San Diego, California

Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris, an interpretation and a critical analysis by J. BOYD Oxford. Blackwell, 1942 (12/6).

Professor Boyd, who has recently (in the new and distinguished series of Blackwell's German Texts) shown himself to be a judicious editor of Goethe's poems, has now published a study of *Iphigenie*. His sub-title, I fear, overstates the scope of his attempt—instead of an “interpretation,” he submits a useful running commentary, scene by scene, on the psychological and dramatic plausibility of Goethe's play. In a brief Introduction, he summarizes the gradual transformation of the Greek matter, and reminds us that the awkward humanitarian twist of the fable is common to several pre-Goethean *Iphigenie* plays. For his general appraisal of the work itself Mr. Boyd does not, apparently, wish to go beyond the conventional terminology; but it should have been possible to eliminate from a serious argument such loose terms as “an objective play,” or “reflecting some of Goethe's own experiences”; or so shop-worn and merely entertaining a metaphor as (p. 16): “Goethe had suffered the pursuit of the Furies after his shameful desertion of Friederike Brion”.

On the whole, however, Mr. Boyd is a fair reader. He refuses to be troubled by what most critics have felt to be the extraordinarily problematical position of *Iphigenie* within the whole canon of Goethe's earlier work. With all its seeming “objectivity,” it is, as Mr. Trevelyan has recently reminded us, a work of transition; and as such it is the crux and touchstone of any interpretation, not only of the coherence of Goethe's poetic life, but of the very nature of his idiom. Mr. Boyd's learning (of which a varied appendix of notes gives ample evidence) has, I suspect, prevented him from judging the poetic issue directly and freshly. Indeed, with the kind or intensity of the play's texture, he is not really concerned. Instead, he is anxious to praise the correctness of Goethe's weave and to point to an occasional implication that might not at once be obvious. In some respects, of course, he is bound to invite disagreement—not, perhaps, so much in his exposition of details as in the general direction of his critical approach. His discussion, for instance (p. 70 ff.) of the discrepancy in the third act, between Iphigenie's “barbaric” nature and her qualities of eighteenth-century “humanitarianism” shows the limited validity of his method. Why, he asks, should we demand of Iphigenie a consistency which does not “in reality” exist? And must we not question “Goethe's wisdom in choosing a Greek theme as a vehicle for modern thought”? Goethe's defence, Mr. Boyd submits, might be that, in all his productions, “the ethics were of only secondary importance, he was in the first place an artist and a poet, and never dramatized a subject for the sake of the ideology or the moral it was capable of expounding, but because he saw in it suitable

material for a poetic work. The 'Idee' grew spontaneously out of the subject." This must seem a strangely simplified answer—but Mr. Boyd reduces the Iphigenie dilemma still further: "the only valid question . . . is whether in thus taxing his reader's imagination by a combination of extremes (!), Goethe has not made undue demands on the reader's imagination, thus detracting from his aesthetic enjoyment of the poem." Surely the greatness of the play does not primarily lie in the "charm" of its "message," but in the manner in which the fundamental dichotomy is being dramatically and poetically evolved.

Mr. Boyd (p. 93 ff.) deals at some length with the healing of Orest. He would not find this issue nearly so troublesome if he did not insist on treating it, again, as a problem of psychological consistency, but, rather, as a poetic device which must be tested, not so much for its naturalistic plausibility as for the efficacy of its dramatic function. His summary (pp. 116-124) of the critics' divergent views of Iphigenie's prayer is more successful, and there is much in Mr. Boyd's examination of Act V that will be readily welcomed by teacher and student alike. He ends with an interpretation of Thoas' "Lebt wohl!" which shows, I think, that in spite of the insufficiently astringent critical attitude, he approaches the human issue of the play with much sympathetic warmth. "Thoas," he concludes (p. 139), "is the tragic figure of the play. His is the sacrifice and the future loneliness." Possibly so, but I am not certain that this is not a somewhat parenthetical reflection.

We shall be grateful for Mr. Boyd's convenient book, but we hope that he can be patient with those who will insist on pushing the critical appraisal of so cardinal a work a good deal further than he has chosen to do.

VICTOR LANGE

Cornell University

The Spirit of the Age. By JOHN STUART MILL. Introductory essay by FREDERICK A. VON HAYEK. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. xxxiii + 94. \$1.50

From Jan. 6, 1831 to May 29, 1831, John Stuart Mill serially published five sections of an essay, "The Spirit of the Age," in *The Examiner*. They were read by Carlyle who "hunted out" the author, and "his acquaintance," wrote Mill years later, "is the only substantial good I have yet derived from writing these papers."

Their republication, with an introduction by Frederick A. von Hayek, supplies scholars with an accessible edition. Though Mill aptly estimated the work as being the first of his writings of any worth, he omitted it from his *Dissertations and Discussions*, and, until now, scholars have had to read it in *The Examiner*, if they

read it at all. Mr. von Hayek states that its value lies "in the light it throws on one of the most interesting phases of the development of a great figure of the past century," but failed to indicate precisely what. The introduction is excellent so far as it goes, but absence of comment on the contents of the essay itself, failure to compare it with similar contemporary essays on the same theme, omission of comment concerning the *milieu* in which the essay was written and its motivating object, and the lack of any statement relating this early essay to Mill's later, and more important, work, are conspicuous. For, though "The Spirit of the Age" was a tract for the times, it was also a prolegomena to Mill's subsequent political essays.

The controlling idea of the essay is that the generation lived in an age of transition which should be converted to an age of transformation by the redistribution of political power and by the establishment of a new "authority" of scientific knowledge of society and power of adjustment through the selective processes of a democracy more liberal than existed before the passage of the first Reform Bill. Though the essay anticipates some of the work of Carlyle, Disraeli, and Arnold in the criticism of the English aristocracy (pointing out its political ineptitude and its neglect of its responsibilities in readjusting English law and institutions to needs of the new age), its ineffectiveness is obvious when its faulty structure is analyzed. Its five sections are only tenuously connected and its abrupt ending, with an epilogue of five brief paragraphs, suggests either that Mill had not really thought his way through his problem to a workable solution, or that the abrupt shift of tendency in favor of reform caught him unprepared.

The text is well edited but on page 14 the editor might have corrected the sentence, "To be rationally assured that a given doctrine is it [*sic*] true, is often necessary . . ." and the "s" might have been supplied to "it" in the sentence on page 42. ". . . the former state does not contain in itself the seeds of it [*sic*] own dissolution."

WILLIAM S. KNICKERBOCKER

Windsor, Connecticut

English Bards and Grecian Marbles, The Relationship between Sculpture and Poetry, Especially in the Romantic Period. By STEPHEN A. LARRABEE New York. Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp ix + 312. \$3.50.

The attitudes of English men of letters to Greek art and culture and the changes wrought in these attitudes in the course of time form a rich and significant, if somewhat neglected, phase of literary history. This book is one of the very few which have appeared in

recent years, treating certain strands in English Hellenism. Mr. Larrabee limits his study to "that English poetry, up to and including the Romantic period, which is inspired by ancient Greek sculpture" His method is primarily critical and only secondarily historical. Thus, after a not very fruitful survey of English poetry which drew inspiration from ancient Greek sculpture from the Twelfth Century to the Romantic period, he turns to the main business of his book, writing separate chapters on Blake, Wordsworth and Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Landor and Hunt and "The Lesser Poets" His conclusions, based as they are more on critical than on historical analysis, are neither very striking nor especially new "Blake found in the Antique what he found in all great art: visions expressed in perdurable forms, outlines given to matter by the imagination (p. 119)" "Wordsworth . . . discovered a simplicity, dignity, and grace in modern life comparable to that of the Greeks (p. 148)." "Both the Grecian hatred of tyranny and the devotion to liberty were to be admired and, what is more, to be revived in a world Byron felt was in great need of regeneration (p. 174)." "The ruins of Rome and Greece and the East attracted Shelley, not so much as symbols of physical power or signs of the grandeur of ancient empires, but as 'monuments vital with mind' and testimony to the conquest of matter by the mind of man (p. 201)." "When he [Keats] was under the spell of the ancient marbles, he wrote in a spirit akin to that of the Greeks . . . In *Endymion*, the 'Ode on a Grecian Urn,' and the 'Ode on Indolence' he described statues and vases, and drew from them images to achieve sculptural effects, that is, to re-create the feeling of sculpture in the medium of the poet (p. 231)" "Among the poets and critics of the Romantic period . . . description of antique forms was supplemented and largely replaced by imaginative and poetic interpretation, and admiration of the canons of proportion of the Antique gave way to study of the inner harmony and organic form (p. 287)."

English Romantic Hellenism produced profound and far-reaching results, and one misses, in this work, the depth with which they might have been searched. The book should, however, stimulate more extensive study of this interesting phase of English literature.

BERNARD H. STERN

Brooklyn College

A Collection of Welsh Riddles. By VERNAM E. HULL and ARCHER TAYLOR (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. XXVI, no. 3, pp. viii, 225-326), University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1942.

This collection of 485 Welsh riddles brings together in convenient form all available printed sources, some of which are rare and difficult of access. Here for the first time they are translated into English and arranged in general according to the plan of Lehmann-Nitsche's collection of Argentinian riddles, that is, according to construction and not solution. An index of solutions otherwise makes possible the location of any riddle. The editors have called attention to some of the characteristics of Welsh riddles. They are based largely on rural life, as might be assumed, but here striking gaps are found. Counterparts are met for most of the riddles among other peoples, but it is significant that some of the Welsh riddles have no parallels in English. Archer Taylor, who has in manuscript a comprehensive collection of English riddles, was able to verify this fact. Compared with the riddles of other Celtic languages the Welsh riddle does not give evidence of a purely Celtic tradition of riddling, we see rather a strong influence of English riddles upon the Welsh. A striking feature of many Welsh riddles is the rhythm and especially rhyme. The nature of the language lends itself to popular rhymes, and for this reason sometimes extraneous and obscure matter is introduced. The reviewer has been especially interested in those few riddles having affinities to the proverb. The notes have called attention to three of these (nos. 377, 403, 412). There are several others, namely, no. 123: "Fire and water are good servants but bad masters" (Apperson, p. 213); no. 448 and 409 "Like a hog, he does no good till he dies" (ib. p. 494), no. 451 "Money is like muck, not good except it be spread" (ib. p. 422). No. 414 looks as if it were based on a proverb: "Borrowed money doesn't fill the purse," which I have not been able to identify. No. 397 may be compared with the German proverb: "Undank ist das grosste Laster" (Wander iv, 1422), which has antecedents in Latin. The editors have noted that nos. 386-390 seem to show a specifically Welsh tradition of naming three things. This is quite true of the Welsh proverb of which an unusually large number begin with the words "Tri pheth," etc. This formula is so very characteristic also of many of the old Bardic verses that it may represent something indigenous and not necessarily be derived from Biblical influence, as the note suggests. We look forward with interest to an anthology of Irish traditional riddles promised by the editors.

RICHARD JENTE

University of North Carolina

BRIEF MENTION

Oenone and Paris. By T. H. (1594) Edited by JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1943. Pp. xlv + 46. \$2.50. In 1937 Dr Adams reproduced Thomas Middleton's early imitation of Shakespeare, *The Ghost of Lucrece*. He has now edited, from another unique volume, the earliest known imitation—or rather plagiarism—of Shakespeare, the *Oenone and Paris* of 1594. The title corresponds to *Venus and Adonis* and the poem has "the same theme of unrequited love, approximately the same plot, the same setting, the same stanza, the same richly ornate style," and countless clear echoes which are illustrated in the introduction and fully recorded in the notes. When the volume came into fresh notice at Sotheby's sale in 1925, the Shakespearean connection was recognized and Thomas Heywood was suggested as the probable author. Dr. Adams makes out an elaborate and plausible case for Heywood's authorship, though the evidence, being mainly internal, cannot be conclusive—the initials, which fit no other known author of the time, the youthful character of the poem; the fact that it was "the first fruits" of the author's "indeuours"; the abundant marks of a classical education; Heywood's notable fondness for Ovid (especially the story of Oenone and Paris) and Lucian (whose influence Dr. Adams sees in the account of the judgment of Paris), parallels with Heywood's later translations from Ovid and with his plays, echoes of Shakespeare in his plays; and so on. Some of these arguments may perhaps be discounted a little. Almost every Elizabethan author had a classical education quite adequate for this piece. And while Heywood made later use of Lucian, and may have done so here, a cursory reading discloses no un-Ovidian items in the picture of the judgment of Paris which might not have come from, say, Peele's *Arraignement of Paris* and *Tale of Troy*. However, there seems to be no other candidate for the authorship, and the positive case for Heywood is strong; incidentally, his view of plagiarism must have altered considerably in later years. *Oenone and Paris* is not important in itself and must take a humble place in the long list of Elizabethan pieces of the kind, but since it has been inaccessible and has some adventitious interest, we may welcome this careful edition.

DOUGLAS BUSH

Harvard University

Plato on the Trial and Death of Socrates (Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo) translated with introduction and prefatory notes by LANE COOPER. Ithaca Cornell University Press, 1941. Pp. ix + 200. In this volume, Professor Cooper offers a new translation of the four dialogues dealing with the trial and death of Socrates, with a somewhat general preface to each dialogue, an introduction to the whole, and a chronological table. In such a translation, one looks for accuracy and readability, and the standards here are on the whole well satisfied. There are, however, a few slips in translation, and rather more numerous failures in felicity. In *Euthyphro* (11e p 32) the phrase "are languid" for *τροφᾶν* is bad, and gives a false sound to the entire paragraph in which it stands. In *Crito* (44e p 85) *συκοφάνται* is mistranslated "sycophants." In other cases, an attempt to follow the Greek too closely has led to a misunderstanding of the real meaning of the original. Thus, in *Apology* (20ab p 52) we find "Callias . . . if your two sons had been colts or calves, we should have no trouble in finding someone to look after them . . . but now that they are human beings . . ." Here the Greek *νῦν δ'* serves, as so often, to mark the speaker's return from a contrary-to-fact supposition to things as they really are, the translation is a distortion. The same fault is seen more clearly in the following (*Crito* 45e p 85) "I am ashamed, both for you and for all of us your friends, for fear the whole affair concerning you may seem, etc." (*italics mine*). Here *αἰσχύνουμαι μὴ δόξῃ* is rendered with a kind of false fidelity the inaccuracy of which is betrayed by the fact that it necessitates an impossible English construction. Again "The day before the trial it happened that the prow was crowned with laurel of the ship which the Athenians send to Delphi" (*Phaedo* 58a p 111). Apart from the facts that "prow" should be "stern" (*πρύμνα*) and that "Delphi" should be "Delos," this sentence is quite unnecessarily awkward. Such faults are major blemishes, but are fortunately not too frequent in what is on the whole a very readable rendering.

RICHMOND LATTIMORE

Bryn Mawr College

Studies in the Comic. By B. H. BRONSON, J. R. CALDWELL, W. H. DURHAM, B. H. LEHMAN, GORDON MCKENZIE, and J. F. ROSS. Berkeley and Los Angeles University of California Press, 1941. Pp. 148. Here are six undocumented essays on Shakespeare, Swift, Gay, Sterne, "the solemn Romantics," and Dickens. Each is concerned with comic, humorous, or satirical aspects of the several authors; but the writers do not arrive at any agreement concerning the general nature of comedy. In Shakespeare, the comic is related to a perception of incongruities between appearance and

reality (W. H. Durham), in Gay, it is playful on the surface, but intimates that society, high and low, is steeped in rascality (B H Bronson), and in Dickens it closely resembles the sarcastic black-and-white artistry of the French caricaturist Daumier (Gordon McKenzie). In the case of the Romantics, after barring Byron and Lamb from the discussion, we find the few attempts to be merry very awkward indeed to them the realm of the comic, i. e., the chaotic and anomalous, were merely fanciful, they were preoccupied with the ideal and harmonious (J. R. Caldwell).

B H Bronson's essay is an admirable appreciation of *The Beggar's Opera*. J. F. Ross's study of the fourth voyage of *Gulliver's Travels* is fundamentally sound in its insistence that we are not to regard Gulliver's views identical with those of Swift, but I do not believe that such a misinterpretation has been as common as Dr Ross supposes. B H Lehman's "Of Time, Personality, and the Author" points out that the attitudes and purposes of Sterne, especially in *Tristram Shandy*, have become clearer to us than to his contemporaries. Readers of our day, acquainted with Joyce and Proust, can better appreciate an author who tries, like Sterne, to present human realities without moral preconceptions, to free himself from clock-measured one-way time, and to portray not logically consistent characters but complex emotional personalities.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

The Educational Theories of John Ruskin. By HILDA BOETTCHER HAGSTOTZ. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1942. Pp 294. \$2.50. That John Ruskin should have had much to say on the subject of education was almost foreordained. Few indeed can have been subjected to a more relentless and thorough drill than this only son of a father thirty-four years of age and a mother thirty-eight at the time of his birth. All readers of *Præterita* know the story. Many have wondered how young John survived. He did, however, with profit to himself and to the world. If for no other reason it is valuable to listen to his own criticism of his experience and to observe how in his own teaching he turned it to advantage.

This is not the first published study of Ruskin's educational theories, but it is the most thorough. The completion in 1912 of the great Cook and Wedderburn edition of Ruskin's *Works* in thirty-nine volumes opened the way for a more elaborate evaluation of his pronouncements on the subject, and Dr. Hagstotz has made much of the opportunity. Her book serves as an admirable index to the educational theories scattered throughout Cook and Wedderburn, and as a good commentary upon them. No matter what the

source of his thought, anything that Ruskin says has been transformed in his mind, and comes forth with Ruskinian accent. As one who believes that in this day even more than heretofore Ruskin's remarks on education are timely and vital, I take pleasure in commending this study to all who wish to become acquainted with a man whose casual sayings, sometimes wayward or mocking, frequently contain as much of wisdom as the more studied utterances of lesser minds.

WALDO H. DUNN

Scrpps College

The Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer. Selected and edited by E. J. HOWARD and G. D. WILSON. Revised and corrected edition. The Anchor Press: Oxford, Ohio, 1942. Pp. xxxii + 199. \$1.20. This book will be useful in introductory courses where there is little emphasis on a study of the language, and where instructors will be glad to have the Tale of Sir Thopas and the Franklin's Tale, among others, made accessible. For any thoroughgoing study, however, the many prologues included will not compensate for the omission of the Knight's Tale and the Clerk's Tale, the grammatical introduction and the notes will need very considerable expansion; and the glossary will require further apparatus and some changes. The text, as far as I have examined it, appears to be based on Manly's edition (though, as I happen to note, it is a pity the corrected form "Lyvia," Wife of Bath's Pro. 747, was not included). The book on the whole has rather too many errors: for example, in the case of Sercambi (p. xxvii) the pilgrims do not tell the tales as seems to be here implied, *lengthe* and *reste* (p. xxx) are not good examples for the petrified dative inasmuch as they take an *e* in other constructions (*lengthe* probably derives from the Old English form ending in a vowel, and *reste* comes from the Old English feminine); *daungerous* (p. 134) is not well glossed as "severe," nor is "sowded" (p. 192) "inclined towards," nor "elvyssh" (p. 142) "elflike"; the *Somnium Scipionis* (p. 150) is, as the editors undoubtedly know, paraphrased in the *Parliament*. with regard to the relic at the Abbey at Hales (p. 155) there seems to have been something actually in the vial which purported to be blood; the introduction overemphasizes the corruption of the medieval Church and fails to take account adequately of its achievements in educational and artistic matters as well as its spiritual gains (as indeed it makes too much of Madame Eglantine's worldliness considering the quality of her narrative).

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

Geoffroy Tory and Catherine de Medici, an unpublished manuscript of Geoffroy Tory of the genealogy of the Counts of Boulogne concerning the French ancestry of Catherine de Medici, Queen of France. Edited by GUSTAVE COHEN Translated from the French by SAMUEL A IVES New York H. P. Kraus, 1944. Pp. 50 \$2.75. Henri IV's first wife used to refer to his second as your "belle banquise" The king might have retorted that his first wife's mother was also a Medici and similarly tainted with membership in a family of merchants He may have been restrained by the fact that Catherine had tried to cleanse her scutcheon by insisting on the descent of her mother, Madeleine de Bourges, from Legner, nephew of no less a person than "Artus Roy de Bretagne." In proof whereof *La Généalogie des Contes de Boulongne* came into existence in 1531. The manuscript, prepared in all probability, as M. Cohen indicates, by Geoffroy Tory, passed into the hands of Thomas Astle (1735-1903), then into those of the Earl of Leicester (1775-1811), subsequently into the collection of Mr. Kraus at 64 East 55th St. It has now been reproduced in French, with two pages devoted to facsimiles, and is preceded by M. C's learned introduction, translated by Mr. Ives into English that is at times unfortunately Gallic. The brochure is beautifully printed and illustrated. It is one that would have given pleasure to Queen Catherine and should attract the friends of her mother's country.

H. C. L.

Urbane Travelers, 1591-1635. By BOIES PENROSE, F. R. G. S. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press, and London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. x + 251. \$3.00. *Fulke Greville's Caelica: An Evaluation.* By WILLIAM FROST. Brattleboro, Vermont Privately Printed, 1942. Pp. vi + 62. \$1.00. Mr. Penrose's *Urbane Travelers* deals with seven Englishmen who travelled widely between 1591 and 1635: Fynes Moryson, John Cartwright, Thomas Coryate, William Lithgow, George Sandys, Sir Thomas Herbert, and Sir Henry Blount. Besides giving a biographical sketch of each, the author traces his itinerary in detail and summarizes his impressions. On the whole, the essays are entertaining; their chief value to students of Elizabethan and Jacobean life lies in the description of several representative English personalities and numerous typically English attitudes. The reader who does not know the writings of the travellers at first hand would, however, doubtless be willing to sacrifice geographical minutiae in favor of fuller quotations from the originals.

As an attempt to remove Greville from the shadow of Sidney's reputation and show that he merits more attention than he commonly receives, Mr. Frost's monograph is welcome. In his charac-

teristic manner of thought, Greville frequently resembles the Metaphysicals more than Sidney, and his metaphors and vocabulary are often racily close to everyday life. In fact, an even fuller exposition of these points and a more searching analysis of Greville's relation to various intellectual movements of his time could profitably replace the attention given such nonessentials as the number of dining rooms in Warwick Castle and a summary of Lee's history of the sonnet.

ROLAND B. BOTTING

The State College of Washington

Annals of the New York Stage, XIII (1885-1888). By GEORGE C D ODELL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. xviii + 723. \$8.75. With this volume Professor Odell approaches the beginnings of the modern American theatre. There are many persons in our generation who remember the plays and most certainly the players whose early careers are here recorded. Kyrle Bellew, Otis Skinner, John Drew, May Irwin, Ada Rehan, Richard Mansfield, E. H. Sothern, J. Forbes-Robertson, Mary Anderson, Modjeska, Lillian Russell, Francis Wilson, Clara Morris, McIntyre and Heath, Salvini, Rose Coghlan, Nat Goodwin, Effie Shannon, Sidney Drew, De Wolf Hopper, James A. Herne, Henry Miller, David Belasco—these names are still fresh enough to remind us that theatre-going in America was not so long ago an exciting adventure. The three years covered by this volume were full of varied theatrical and musical activity. Professor Odell's diligent research opens windows into our past and helps us understand not only the traditions that have faded, but those that are still factors in our dramatic writing, acting, and criticism. The amount of material—playbills, illustrations, and quotations from contemporary reviews—asssembled here is prodigious. Historians of the American drama and theatre, of American culture in general, will forever be indebted to Professor Odell.

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

The Johns Hopkins University

A Comparison between the Two Stages: A Late Restoration Book of the Theatre. Edited by STANING B. WELLS. Princeton Studies in English, xxvi. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. xxii + 206. \$3.00. Into his ninety-eight pages of notes Dr Wells has packed a great deal of information about the last phase of the Restoration theater. His introduction includes a judicious estimate of the anonymous author, "one of the crackbrains of the day"—the ascription to Gildon

is rejected. *A Comparison* illustrates the "close relationship between neo-classical criticism and the spirit of reform in the development and popularization of the moralizing drama of the eighteenth century." Mr. Wells's chief service is of course in making his text more widely available, this is the first reprint since its original appearance in 1702. Students of English drama and of eighteenth-century criticism will welcome the opportunity of adding this excellent volume to their shelves.

H. S.

Selected Poems of Sir William Davenant. With a prefatory note by DOUGLAS BUSH. Cambridge, Mass. Geoffrey Bush, The Willow Press, 1943. Pp. 43. \$2 00 In this little book, Professor Bush reprints some verses from *Madagascar*, the *Works* of 1673, and from the plays. The selections are well chosen and reveal all the poetical facets of Davenant. Good taste, however, runs through Professor Bush's family, for the volume, handset and printed by his own son, is one of the finest examples of printing that I have seen in a long while. I especially commend it to all lovers of fine printing and to those directors of university presses, who delight in exalting poets to their own "bad eminence" by sending them forth clad in an inelegant format.

D. C. A.

Experiments in Education. By LANE COOPER. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1943. Pp. ix + 176. \$2.50. (Cornell Studies in English, Vol. xxxiii). This is a collection of fourteen addresses, essays, and pedagogical advices by one of the most learned and influential teachers of our day. The last ten chapters which are devoted to course plans and teaching hints are required reading for all teachers of language and literature. From these essays one gathers not only valuable advice but an important lesson—Professor Cooper was never satisfied with the way a course was taught; he sought always for a new and better method; he was not afraid to experiment. That knowledge is a good antidote for the inflexible complacency that comes over so many of us after we have passed "*il mezzo del cammin di nostra vita*." The volume concludes with a bibliography of Professor Cooper's writings.

D. C. A.

CORRESPONDENCE

NOCH EINMAL "WES DAS HERZ VOLL IST" In einem früheren Heft der *MLN*¹ hat W. Kurrelmeyer für Luthers berühmte Verdeutschung der *Vulgata*-Stelle "*Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur*" eine sieben Jahre ältere Parallele nachgewiesen. In der von Pauli stammenden Fassung des Geilerschen *Evangelibuch* heißt es zwar *was das hertz vol ist, des loufft der mund vber* statt des Lutherschen *gehet über*, aber die beiden Prägungen sind einander zu ähnlich, als daß sie zweimal unabhängig voneinander entstanden sein könnten. Mit Recht betont aber Kurrelmeyer den umgangssprachlichen Charakter der Wendung, auf den ja auch Luther im *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* anspielt. Sie ist niemandes Eigentum, und die Frage ist offen geblieben, ob sie Luthern aus Geilers Schrift zugeflossen sei oder von wo anders.

Ich glaube, sie ist zu beantworten. In Hieronymus Emsers *Quadruplica auf Luthers Jungst gethane antwort, sein reformation belangend* heißt es auf Seite 131 des Neudrucks² "*dann wie Christus vnd das gemeyn sprichwort sagt, was das hertz vol ist, gehet der mund vber, ex cordis enim abundantia os loquitur, Math. XII*". Die an Luther gerichtete *Quadruplica* erreichte ihren Adressaten Anfang Juli 1522,³ das heißt gerade in dem Augenblick, da die Übersetzung der Evangelien Luthers ganze Aufmerksamkeit in Anspruch nahm. Leicht möglich, daß die Plastik der sprichwörtlichen Wendung in Emsers Kampfschrift sie Luthern empfahl. Er wird sie ohnehin gekannt haben, aber durch Emsers Anwendung wurde sie ihm handgerecht.

Das Pikante dieser Situation liegt darin, daß Luther acht Jahre später im *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* gerade gegen Emser "seine eigene" Version der Matthäus-Stelle verteidigt. "*Wenn ich den Eseln sol folgen, die werden mir die buchstaben furlegen, und also dolmetzschen. Auß dem uberflus des hertzen redet der mund*". Der Hauptesel, den er dabei im Auge hat, hatte aber Luthern selbst die prächtige Wendung in den Mund gelegt, auf die sich nun Luther so viel zu gute tut. Er selber hatte den Tatbestand inzwischen vergessen, Emser war durch den Tod gehindert, sein Besitzrecht geltend zu machen.

Er hatte ja auch keines. Wir lernen von Emser, daß—wie Kurrelmeyer schon richtig vermutet hatte—hier ein *gemeyn sprichwort* vorliegt, gebraucht von der *mutter ym haus*, dem *gemeinen mann in der strassen*, sogar den *Eseln* im katholischen Lager.

ARNO SCHIBOKAUER

Kenyon College

¹ *MLN*, L (1935), 380-382.

² "Luther und Emser. Ihre Streitschriften aus dem Jahre 1521" hrsg. von Ludwig Enders. Bd. II, 1892. [*Braunes Neudrucke* No. 96-98.]

³ Vgl. das Vorwort der Neudrucks S. IX.

WORTH BOTH HIS EARS

Were þe bischop yblessed and worth bothe his eres
His seel shulde nouȝt be sent to deceyue þe peple

Piers Plowman, B text, Prologue 78-9

The gloss "fit to keep both his ears," suggested by Hazelton Spencer (*MLN*, LVIII, 48) is surely no improvement on Skeat's explanation. The meaning of the line is clear when it is considered along with the rest of the passage down to line 82. Line 68, which introduces the pardoner, contains a charge against him which Langland thought quite as important as the common charge of imposing upon the credulity of poor people. This charge was that he preached "as he a priest were," that is he exceeded the terms of the licence he received from the bishop in assuming the status of priest. This his licence did not entitle him to do. If the bishop were "yblessed," that is a truly holy man, he would enquire more closely into the characters of those to whom licences were issued. He would not grant licenses to those who would misuse them, he would take some thought to the spiritual side of the matter instead of issuing licences indiscriminately for the sake of revenue. If he were "worth both his ears," worthy to have both his ears because he made proper use of them, he would soon learn of the abuses practised by the pardoners, and would learn also how they were exceeding the limits of the authority granted them by the licences. The complaints would probably come not mainly from the poor, as Skeat suggests, but from the conscientious parish priests who would not come to terms with the pardoners.

Langland then returns to his first point

Ac it is nauȝt by þe bischop · þat þe boy precheth,
For the parish prest and þe pardoner parten þe siluer
That þe poraille of þe parish sholde haue ȝif þei nere

In the interpretation of "by þe bischop" Skeat seems to have missed the point. He suggests that this means "Yet it is not against the bishop that the young fellow preaches" (ed. E. E. T. S., Part IV, sect. 1, 1877, p. 13). It is so improbable that the pardoner would preach against the bishop that there would be little sense in denying that he did so, and Langland did not waste words in this fashion. The lines mean that the pardoner did not preach, that is assume the function of priest, by any permission of the bishop. The bishop's licence did not allow him to preach. Why, then, did he? The answer follows because the parish priest came to terms with this troublesome competitor and would allow him even the use of his pulpit providing he shared in the pardoner's winnings. The assumption of priestly authority would of course add to the pardoner's prestige in the eyes of the common people and increase his profits. It is the parish priest and not the bishop that is responsible for much of the mischief. "Boy" here means not simply "young fellow," but "scoundrel" or "rogue" (see the article by E. J. Dobson, *Medium Aevum*, IX, 121).

The University of Sydney

A. G. MITCHELL

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

APRIL, 1944

Number 4

ANGLO-FRENCH ETYMOLOGIES

1. CANTANKEROUS < ME. *contak*, *contek* 'strife' The etymological dictionaries are all agreed on the equation represented in the heading of this section, but, with the exception of Weekley, they seem to have no opinions as to the origin of the ME. word. Weekley states "[ME] *contek* is altered from [OF.] *contet* (= 'contest')," and offers an Anglo-French attestation of *contet*: *Mortel cuntet cumence a lvrer en la cité de Nicole* [Mayor of Lincoln, c. 1272]. It would seem that here we have what Prof. Malone, *MLN* LVII, 152, has called "the usual Weekley complement of mistakes," since this *cuntet* offered to us as the source of our ME *contak* is evidently a variant of (or better, in view of the frequent confusion in the Middle Ages between *c* and *t*, the mistake of a copyist for) OF *contec*, *conte(c)k(e)*, *contak*, a word attested especially in Anglo-Norman texts (Godefroy, Tobler-Lommatzsch) in the meaning of 'strife.' This noun must be related to the Northern OF. verb *contechier contequier*, for which Godefroy lists two separate items:

1. 'plaie' (many examples)
2. 'toucher' (three texts from Tournay, two of which contain the phrase *contequier et esproeuver*)
— 'mesurer' (twice the phrase *contechier et adviser*)
— 'uni, mêlé' (a heraldic expression *d'azur . . . une bande contichée d'argent et de gueules*)

In Tobler-Lommatzsch (where only the form *contequier* is used) no such two-fold division is attempted: a distinction is made only between transitive and intransitive:

- intrans. 'zusagen, genehmsein'
trans. 'betasten, befühlen' (*Escoufle. Li mareschaus tos les conteke*
[die Pferde auf dem Markt])

This OF. verb is evidently a derivative from the substantive

teche tache 'mark, notch, tally' (Godefroy: 'marque distinctive, qualité en général, en parlant de bonnes qualités . . en parlant de mauvaises qualités'). Thus *con-tech-ier*, considered as an intransitive, would mean something like 'to come up to the mark, to be of top-notch quality', thus we come immediately to the meaning, which Godefroy chose to list separately 'to please'. And the example from the *Jeux-partis amie mal contegant*, which the editor Långfors glossed as 'une amie qui s'est compromise,' means simply 'a friend who is displeasing' ('qui marque mal'). In its transitive use, this same verb must have had originally the general meaning 'to tally, mark'—or, in phraseology less technical, 'to test' (*contequier et esproeuver*) and 'to measure' (*contechier et adviser*), the meanings 'to touch' (cf. the example from *Escoufle* note that Godefroy considers this as a primary meaning!) and 'to combine' (cf. the heraldic expression) are obviously derivative. From the fundamental idea of 'measuring, testing' inherent to this verb, it would be only a step to that of *'to vie, to measure oneself, with someone'—and thus would be explained the substantive *contec*, *contac* 'strife' which served as source for our English word *cantankerous*. To return to the verb from which this OF. noun was extracted. *con-tech-ier* is derived from *teche* by way of the prefix *con-*; a formation exactly parallel is to be found with OF. *atechier* (= *ad-*) 'souiller' ('to spot') and *entechier* (= *in-*) 'to spot': cf. *fruits entechiés* 'spotted, rotten fruit' (whence Mod. French *entiché* 'having a soft spot [for], doting on'); this last formation tallies with O Prov. *entecar*, *entacar* 'entâcher, souiller' and Span. *entecado* 'lame, paralytic' (*enteco* 'feeble-minded').

If we go back still further to seek the origin of the noun *teche tache* (Ital. *tacca* 'notch, quality,' *Malatacca* as a nickname) itself, we find that there has been proposed a relationship with the Germanic word-family *Zeichen*, *token* (cf. REW s. v. **tarkka*). But in view of the fact that in Romance there is missing the *-n-* of the proto-Germ. **taikn-*, it seems to me more reasonable to admit for our Romance noun an onomatopoeic stem **takk-* **tekk-* 'to strike, to nick' parallel to **tokk-* (Fr. *toucher*). To such a **tekk-* form would belong also Mod. Prov. *têco* 'tache' (syn. *taco*), 'pierre qui sert de point de marque à certains jeux' (syn. *toco*), 'gros morceau, lopin, guignon,' 'coup, blessure,' *têchi techo* 'homon, soufflet, blessure, meurtrissure, coup, cicatrice,' 'morceau

de pain, tranche de fromage,' 'sot, imbécile' (lit. 'marked with a blow'); *têc* 'stupide, ébahi, interdit'; *têcle* 'myope, ébahi, interdit, stupide', O. Prov. *tecola* 'boule de bois pour le jeu de quille', Sp. *tecla* 'key of a musical instrument' (this does not belong to *tegula*, REW s. v), Catal. *tech* in the phrase *fer un gran tech* 'to stow away a lot of food' (lit. 'to make a big dent'), *tecla* 'weak point, foible.'

2. CULPRIT. This word, in the legal reference 'prisoner at the bar, the accused, the offender,' was, according to the NED, originally used only in the formula 'Culprit, how will you be tried?', a question formerly put to a prisoner indicted for high treason or felony who had pleaded 'Not guilty.' In the following passage the editors recapitulate and endorse the explanation first given by Blount in his *Law Dictionary*:

Known (as a word) only from 1678 According to the legal tradition, found in print shortly after 1700, *culprit* was not originally a word, but a fortuitous or ignorant running together of two words (the fusion being made possible by the abbreviated writing of legal records), viz Anglo-Fr *culpable* or L *culpabilis* 'guilty,' abbreviated *cul*, and *prist* or *prest* = OF *prest* 'ready' It is supposed that when the prisoner had pleaded 'Not guilty,' the Clerk of the Crown replied with '*Culpable: prest d'averrer nostre bille*,' i. e. 'Guilty [and I am] ready to aver our indictment'; that this reply was noted on the roll in the form *cul prist*, etc; and that, at a later time, after the disuse of law French, his formula was mistaken for an appellation addressed to the accused

NOTE—This explanation is in accordance with the fact that the formula *prest* (*prist*) is of constant occurrence in mediaeval procedure, to signify that the parties are ready to go to judgment on a point of law, or to trial on an issue of fact . . . [examples]. Moreover *non cul prist* actually appears as an abbreviated form [a passage of the *Liber assisarum* of Edward I, with the French sentence *De rien culpable, prest d'averrer nostre bill* is cited in an abridgement of 1568 as *non cul prist*]

This explanation seems "not altogether satisfactory" to the English etymologist Weekley, it must be absolutely rejected by any Romance scholar. This *prist* which does not appear before 1568, and then only in an adulterated abridgement, is no O. Fr. form (O. Fr. *prest*!); even if the legal term were the O. Fr. *prest*, there is no good reason for the subsequent loss of the -s- (which was retained in ME. *prest* 'loan'). Finally it is generally a dubious procedure to seek for etymologies in "mistakes"; in this particular case it is most unlikely that a formula in which the

Clerk of the Crown asserts his decision would have been "later" misinterpreted as an appellation addressed to the accused

I would rather propose that *culprit* be accepted from the beginning as a "word"—a word meaning simply 'guilty'.¹ And, in spite of the late attestation of the English term, I suggest that it was based upon an O Fr. **coulperiez* = *coupable*, which would represent a formation in which the suffix *-erez* (> L. *-aricus* [*annulus*] *sigillarius* in Vopiscus) was added to *cou(l)pe* 'guilt' (cf. It. *-ereccio* in *casereccio*, *villereccio*, *vernereccio* etc.) This suffix was common in O Fr., and though **coulperiez* is not mentioned in the list given by A. Thomas, *Nouveaux essais de phil. franç.*, p. 62 and 359 seq., still such a form is no more surprising than are many of the others he lists. O Fr. *bannerez* (mod Fr. *banneret*) 'qui a le droit d'avoir une bannière' (from *ban*), O Fr. *bataillerez* 'ardent à la bataille,' O Fr. (*seigneur*) *gageret* 'qui possède à titre de gage,' O Fr. *damerez* (mod Fr. *dameret*) 'homme dont la tenue, les manières rappellent celles d'une dame'.² The presence of *-t* instead of *-z* could be due to an analogical reconstruction of an oblique case, after the pattern of *amanz-amant* (cf. O Fr. *tyranz* 'tyrant'—analogical oblique case *tyrant* = Eng. *tyrant*, O Fr. *romanz* = Eng. *romance* *romant* = Eng. *romant*, mod Fr. *chevet* from O Fr. *chevez* [*< *capitum*]) Traces of *-erez* unaltered may be found in the English forms *buttress*, *butteris*, *butterice*³ (= O Fr. *bouterez*, Thomas, *Rom.* xxix, 164-5), as well as of the corresponding feminine suffix *-erece* *fortress*, *fortalice*, *fortiless* (= O Fr. *forterece*). Incidentally, in both these groups may be found parallels for the loss of the first *-e-* and the development of the second *-e-* to *-i-*—just as we find it in *culprit* < **culperiez*.

As regards the fact that by chance, no **coulperiez* has been attested, this should present no real difficulty to any one who is acquainted with the way in which English has preserved French words that have perished from the original tongue. Of course, my hypothesis hinges on the assumption that Eng. *culprit* is much older than 1678, I do not feel personally capable of attempting to bridge the gap of the preceding centuries.

¹ This was the feeling of Wedgwood, who suggested the possibility of a corruption of *culpat* (= *culpatus*).

² For the semantic development of the adjectives with *-erez* to nouns with the meaning 'able, disposed to do or be something,' cf. Gamillschag, *Bibl. dell' Arch. rom.* III², 14: **couperez* must have been equal to *coup-able*.

³ For OF *-z* > E. *-ce* cf. also *coppice*, *copse* > OF. *copeis* (*-aticus*-suffix).

3. **DALLY** This word, in the meaning 'to converse, chat, pass one's time in light social converse' is attested, according to the NED, since 1300 (the noun *dalliance* since 1340) and is considered to have been borrowed from the Anglo-Norman *daher*, which is attested in the compound form *s'entredaher* with the meaning 'to tease one another' in the 12th cent. (*Quatre Liv des Rois*, cf. Godef and FEW), the simple form *daher* is listed by P. Meyer in his glossary to Nicole Bozon's *Contes moraux*sés (ed. Soc. des anc. textes 1889), written about 1320. The FEW attests the word also in (Old) Walloon: *dallher* 'railler' (15th c, Jean de Stavelot) and in Lorraine: *daillh* 'dire des sornettes aux portes ou aux fenêtres des maisons, le soir, en contrefaisant sa voix.' This kind of social game known as *dailllement*, *daillon*, has been attested by P. Meyer in *Bulletin de la Soc. des anc. textes* 1876, p. 114; by Bonnardot in *Méluène* I, 570, and by Laurent and Halland *ibid* II, 327: *darement* is attested for Metz since the 15th century.

As for the etymology of this Anglo-Norman and frontier dialect word, we find the following comment in the FEW s.v. *dahlen* (Germ) 'tandeln'.

Horning . . und M[eyer-] L[ubke] . . hatten von afr *daillh* 'sense' [= 'scythe'] ausgehen wollen Dem widersprechen aber die Laute, da afr *daher* dreisilbig war, ausserdem wäre auch die bed [eutungs-] entw [icklung] schwer verständlich . . D [eutsch] *dahlen* ist zwar erst im 16. Jh belegt, erscheint aber im deutschen sprachgebiet weit herum heimisch, sogar im obersächsischen Es erscheint daher wohl möglich, dass die ein jh fruher belegten ostfr formen dem d. entlehnt sind, wo *dahlen* nach Weigand einheimisch sein kann Dann musste das agn Wort dem ags. entnommen sein, dessen spätere vertreter me *dahlen* 'tandeln,' ne. *dally* waren

[note Diese sind bisher als dem agn. entlehnt aufgefasst worden].

Thus the Walloon and Lorraine dialect forms would be of German origin (*dahlen*), while the Anglo-Norman word, contrary to the opinion of earlier scholars, is considered to be of OE. origin (and our Eng. word *dally* would be a direct offspring of the OE. word). But von Wartburg fails to specify the exact OE. etymon he has in mind (is he thinking of an OE. parallel to Germ *dahlen*?—but 'Obersächsisch' is not Anglo-Saxon!). The dictionary of Kluge-Götze (s.v. *dahlen*) continues to derive *dally* (ME *dallien*) from Anglo-Norman *daher* without offering any Germanic etymon—even for the German word *dahlen* itself, which is attested as late as the 16th century.

Obviously, the Anglo-Norman origin of Eng *dally* is sure.⁴ But what is the etymon of this Anglo-Norman *daher*? If we consider the two passages from Nicole Bozon's *Contes moralisés* containing the verb *daher*, it becomes apparent that the original meaning could not have been 'to talk':

[in n° 59 the friar has been speaking about the accumulative influence exerted by bad company]

chescun se joynt a autre en malice, *ne est mye bon a daher od tiel part* mes bon serreit qe ceux que unt le poer de tiel compaignie les severassent chescun de autre et les plantassent en diverse lieus

[in n° 68 he speaks of the hedgehog who when attacked resists all the more strongly, but can be made to open up when tepid water is poured over him]

Pur ceo nous aprent *coment devoms daher od gentz* qui sont en power de baillie ou de seignurie, qe par estre tariez ['provoked'] de grosse parolez, ne volent estre vencuz, mès par ewe, souple parole et priere volent estre vencuz

It seems clear that P. Meyer's translation 'converser, jaser,' as well as that of Tobler-Lommatzsch ('sich unterhalten mit jem., tadeln') is wrong; such expressions as *ne est mye bon a daher od tiel part* and *ceo nous aprent coment devoms daher od gentz qui . . .* are best translated by the English phrase 'to deal with [such] people' 'Jaser' is excluded as a translation for the first example, in the second, for which Weekley (s. v. *dally*) offers the translation 'to behave, deal judiciously' (without, however, drawing any conclusion therefrom), we may see a beginning of the shift from 'to have dealings with s. o.' to 'to handle, manage s. c.—by clever talk' (*par . . . souple parole*). As for the meaning 'tease,' this may be discerned in a third example from Bozon (*Char d'Orgueil*, v. 292, ed. Visung):

[it is a sign of good breeding when ladies love one another].

Mes eles unt envye quant veyent chivaler
Plus a une ke a autre *de parole dayler*

(the noun *estrief* is mentioned l. 285) But it is only the compound expression '*de parole dayler*' which gives this meaning: *dayler* alone cannot refer to (teasing) speech.

⁴The underlying Anglo-Norman form can be as well *daher* (cf. *tarry* <OF *entariere* <vulg. Lat. **in-teritare* REW 4491) as *dailler* (cf. *tally* <OF *taill(er)*)

By now it must have become obvious that, as the etymon of the Anglo-Norman *dahier* I shall suggest the English word-family *to deal* 'to give s.o. his due share,' or, more specifically, the OE. *dál* 'a division, portion, allotment, *dole*,' (Proto-Germ **dail-*, German *Teil*) which is a parallel form to OE. *dál* and which has given the mod. Eng. *dole*—or, in the Northern phonetic development, *dale*. All that is necessary to make this suggestion acceptable is to assume that the meaning of this *dole*, *dale* 'dealing, having to do with, business' which is attested in ME. since the 14th century (NED s. vv.) already existed in OE. The date of the borrowing of the Anglo-Norman word must be earlier than the *a > o* development in ME, of which the first traces are attested sporadically in the 11th century and which is finally achieved everywhere (with the single exception of the North where *-a-* is still retained today) by the 15th century (K. Luick, *Hist. Gr. d. engl. Spr.*, p. 369). To the *dal-* stem of the OE. word there was added in French the verbal ending *-ier* (= *-oyer* < Greco-Lat. *-izare*), cf. *manner*, *plaidier-plaidoyer*, *charrier-charroyer* (Eng. *carry*).⁵ **dal-ier*.

This OE. etymology explains the Anglo-Norman habitat of *dahier*, thus von Wartburg, in positing an OE. etymon, was correct as far as he went. Whether the Walloon and Lorraine words are borrowed from Anglo-Norman, and whether the German word is derived from the French frontier dialects,⁶ one cannot say. But the sequence ME. *dál* > Anglo-Norman *dahier* (12th cent.) > Eng. *dally* (14th cent.) is sure. The further development of *dally* 'to defer idly' occurs within the course of the purely English history of the word (cf. NED).

⁵ **carr-izare* is, in fact, the ultimate etymon of Eng. *carry*—not *carriacre*, as the NED suggests.

⁶ I am inclined, however, to think that the German *dahlen* goes back, as Kluge-Götze say (not s. v. *dahlen*, but s. v. *Dohle*), to the onomatopoeic Germanic *dalen*, *tallen*, *tullen* 'to chat,' which has given to German such heterogeneous words as the name of the Swiss hero *Tell* (originally meaning 'dull-witted') and the name of the bird 'jack-daw' *Dohle* (variants *dahle*, *dalle*, *dul*; literally 'the chatting bird,' cf. Ital. *taccola* 'jack-daw' > *taccolare* 'to chat'). Thus the Anglo-Norman and the dialectal Fr. words have different etyma, and the secondary 'onomatopoeization' of Eng. *dally-dally* must be distinguished from the primary 'onomatopoeisis' of Germ. *dallern*, *dallera*, *dallen*, *dallend*, *dilledelle*, *dellelle* (variants quoted by the DWb).

4. **FLAUNT.** This verb, according to the NED, means 1) "of plumes, banners etc. To wave gaily or proudly" (*whose feathers flaunt and flicker in the winde*, 1576), 2) "of persons To walk or move about so as to display one's finery, to display oneself in unbecomingly splendid or gaudy attire, to obtrude oneself boastfully, impudently, or defiantly on the public view" (*in suits of silkes to flaunte*, 1566). These intransitive meanings are the first attested; the transitive meaning 'to display ostentatiously . . . to flourish, parade, show off' is quite recent (1827). Of the etymology the NED remarks:

Of unknown origin The monosyllables of similar endings are (exc perh *gaunt*) all from Fr, but no Fr. word is known which could be the source. Possibly the word may be an onomatopoeia formed with a vague recollection of *fly*, *flout* and *vaunt* . . .⁷

⁷ The idea of a blend of several onomatopoeias into one vague compound must, it seems to me, be rejected as long as there is one definite etymon to be proposed. I am not opposed, by principle, either to onomatopoeic etymons or to the assumption of onomatopoeic blends as such, but I would admit these last only in cases where no other (unitarian) explanation is at hand. The NED has a liking for 'mixed onomatopoeias', for example, s. v. *clash* we are told that this noun (attested about 1500) was intended to describe 'the loud sound of collision made by a heavy stroke or blow, the first impact of which is firm and hard, but is followed by a confused sound of many looser and lighter impacts, the kind of blow or strike which yields this sound,' and that the etymology is a kind of compound onomatopoeia. 'Clash suggests an action produced in the same way as the clap or clack, which, instead of abruptly ending like these, is broken down as it were into, and results in, a mingled mass of smashing or rustling sounds (as in *dash*, *splash*, *smash* etc.)' I would rather suggest that *clash* comes from OF *esclachier* (variant of *eschacier*, *eschacier* or of *esclater*), which was deprived of its *es-* (cf *insel* < OF *estincelle*), and from which was also derived (with *-sol-* > *-sl-* as in *slander* < OF *esclandre*) Eng *slash* 'a cutting stroke delivered with an edged weapon or . . . with a whip' (the noun being attested in 1576, the corresponding verb in 1382, in the Wycliffe Bible). Thus, while the NED's description of the double-beat sound represented by *clash* undoubtedly corresponds to modern feelings, this could not have applied to the word originally. Its synonyms, Fr. *esclat* and Ital. *scatto*, reveal nothing of this double-beat rhythm.

Again, the verb *stodge*, attested first in Dryden (1674 'a kind of glibbet porridge . . . stodge full of . . .') and meaning originally 'to fill quite full, to fill to distension, to stuff in as a filling material' in the 19th century, is explained by the NED as 'perhaps phonetically symbolic after words like *stuff*, *podge*' But in this case too there seems to me to be indicated a 'unitarian' etymology. dial. Fr. *étager*, *étuger* etc, OF. *estoyer*, *estuier*

If we turn to *gaunt* we are surprised to find a French etymon proposed,⁸ but the editors are consistent in denying a French origin to *flaunt*. "all other words in -aunt (exc. *flaunt*) are of Fr. origin."

'economize, preserve, spare' In the REW these words are divided among the two articles: (Basque) *estalpe* 'rescue' and **studiare* 'to spend care on something' under *estalpe* are grouped the Berry *etauger* (listed by Joubert) and a Lyons *etezi* (which must be corrected to *étôzi*, v. Putspelu)—along with Prov. *estalbiar*, Catal. *estalviar*, under **studiare* are grouped the OF *estoyer*, the Lyons *atozo* (to be corrected again into *étogi* or *étôys*, *intoys*, v. Putspelu)—along with Prov. *estug* 'etui' Since, however, we find also at Lyons a form *tarba* 'épargne' clearly related with Prov. *estalbiar* (-lb- > -rb), it is obviously preferable to separate the Prov.-Catal. *estalbiar* (-var) from the Fr. dialectal words ending in -*auger*, -*aug*. Along with Berry *étauger* I would place the Vendôme *etuger* 'sortir adroitement d'un pas difficile' (i.e. to preserve oneself?), which would likewise seem, because of its -u-, to be derived from *studiare*. From the meanings 'to care for, to preserve,' 'to put into an *étui*' one comes easily to that of 'to fill quite full, to cram' (esp. in reference to food), cf. Prov. *estuja*, *estucha* 'renfermer, serrer, (en)coffrer,' 'avalier, boire' (Mistral), and such parallels from Fr. argot as *se caler*, *se garnir le fustil*, *se taper la cloche*, *s'en foutre plein la lampe* etc. An *estoger* < **studiare* can give Eng. *stodge*—perhaps the modern Eng. *stooge* was originally a dialect variant of *stodge*, meaning 'a fill-in'.

Finally, the NED suggests a similarly 'mixed onomatopoeic' origin for the verb *flounder* "in early use, to stumble; subsequently, to struggle violently and clumsily, to plunge, roll and tumble about in or as in mire, of a horse, to rear, to plunge" This word (attested as *flunder* since 1590) is explained by the NED "Perh. an onomatopoeic blending of the sound and sense of various earlier words, cf. *Founder* . . . (OF *fondrer*), *Blunder*, and the many vbs. with initial *fl-* expressing impetuous and clumsy movements" But there is possible an explanation much simpler than this assumption of a 'porte-manteau word' à la Lewis Carroll: we find in French, alongside *Flandre* 'Flanders,' the 16th cent. *flandrîn* 'inhabitant of Flanders' The latter, attested since the 15th cent. in the meaning 'fuet, élancé' has, in the various Fr. *patois*, such meanings as 'lent à se mouvoir,' 'fainéant et traînard,' 'paresseux,' 'ouvrier lent ou paresseux'; the Prov. verb derived therefrom, *flandrîna*, means 'fainéanter, lambiner'—in harmony with the French conception of the Flemish (tall and lanky, with a careless attitude), cf. FEW s. v. *Flandern* and *flaming*. A verb **flandrîner* 'to move awkwardly' could give Eng. *flounder* 'to stumble, to tumble about as in a mire'—with *â* > -oun- as in *jounce-jaunce*, *trounce-trance* etc. and with a simplification of the ME. **flaundrenen* to **flaunder*, cf. *louter* from dial. Fr. *loutrîner*.

⁸ The NED would explain *gaunt* as "a graphic adoption of *gant* = OF. *gent*, Gent, elegant"; it seems to me, however, that we have to do simply with the Picardian or Normandian form of Fr. *jaunet*: *gaunet* 'yellowish'

But it is not at all difficult to find a French etymon, provided we do not insist upon an old attestation in standard French. In modern Normandian there is a *flaneter* 'babiller, bavarder' attested in Jersey by the FEW, and representing the diminutive (used in a secondary derived meaning) of the well-known Fr. *flâner* 'aller sans but en se laissant distraire par une chose, par une autre, pour passer le temps.' This verb, as Bruch first showed in *ZfSL* LII, 441, is not attested in Parisian speech until the beginning of the 19th century, but is attested as early as 1645 in Normandy, where it originated, likewise of Normandian origin are probably the nouns *flanerie* (attested at the end of the 16th century with Thomas de Courval, a poet born in Normandy) and *flanier* (attested with Vorture, who was born in Amiens) As for the etymology of *flâner* the FEW remarks s. v. *flana* (anord.) 'unbesonnen herumlaufen'

Wenn man die tatsachen sprechen lasst, so konstatiert man, dass *flâner* und seine ablt seit dem 16 jh in der Normandie belegt sind und hier die reichste semantische entw haben, dass sie erst zu beginn des 19 jh nach Paris gedrunen sind . Man wird daher die von Diez, 585 aufgestellte etym. anord *flana* 'unbesonnen herumlaufen' nicht so ohne weiteres ablehnen, wie das bisher geschehen ist Das einzige moment, das dagegen spricht, ist, dass *flâner* nicht fruher belegt ist. Doch ausschlaggebend kann das nicht sein.

If we assume that some such Normandian derivative of *flâner* as a **flaneter* 'to idle around' is underlying the 16th cent. Eng. *flaunt*, we will have thereby attested the existence of our *flâner* as early as the second half of the 16th, thus it is apparent that, both in derivation and in semantics, the range of this word was considerably greater than might be guessed from the French.

'As for the meaning 'to walk or move about so as to display oneself (or one's plumes, feathers etc.),' this could come directly from the meaning 'to idle around, to fool around'. one may note a similar development with the old Danish *flane* (with which the Old Norse etymon is related); we find in Old Danish the meanings, 'a fool' (sb.), 'to run about' (vb.), and in Modern Danish 'a coquettish woman' (sb.), 'to act coquettishly'; here there is the shift 'fool (-ing)' > 'ostentation' (cf. also a dialectal meaning of *fla(u)nty* as given by Wright in his *Eng. Dial Dict.*: 'capricious, eccentric, unsteady, flighty'). The idea of 'flaunting and flickering in the wind,' which the NED offers as the original one, probably

represents instead a third stage, following upon that of 'to display one's finery.'²

5. To FOIST. Wedgwood (whose definition is adopted by the *Universal Dict*) says of *to foist*. "To *foist*, *feist*, *fizzle* are all originally to break wind in a noiseless manner, and thus to foist is to introduce something the obnoxious effects of which are only learned by disagreeable experience . . . The original is plainly an imitation of the noise." A different etymology is proposed by the NED:

prob ad Du dial *vuisten* to take in the hand, *f vuist* fist; cf Germ dial *fausten* The Du word now means to play at a game in which one player holds some coins in his hand, and the others guess at their number (Prof Gallée)

The original meaning (now obsolete) is

trans (*Dicing*) "to palm (a 'flat' or false die) so as to be able to introduce it when required Also intr to cheat by this means (in [the first] quot 1545 [Ascham. "If they be trew dise, what shyfte will they make to set one of them with slyding, with cogging, with *foysting*, with coytng,¹⁰ as they call it"] app used loosely). *To foist in*: to introduce

² A phonetic confusion is today gaining ground between *to flaunt* and *to flout*, as is pointed out in a letter to the 'Spillway' in the Baltimore morning *Sun*, January 21, 1943): the writer quotes from the San Francisco *Chronicle* the line. 'just before Hitler flaunted the League,' and he comments 'Are we to imagine the dictator seizing that august body and waving it exultingly aloft?'

As for *flout* from 'to play the flute,' cf. not only Dutch *fluiten* 'to mock,' but also Parisian *flûte!* 'expression qui exprime la colère, le mépris ou qu'on en a assez,' Bresse *flûte* 'tromperie, mensonge,' Moselle *je t'en fyut* 'je m'en moque' (FEW s. v. **fla-uta*) and the parallel development of Fr *tromper* originally 'to mock' (< 'to play the trumpet')

¹⁰ This word, first attested in 1440, means 'a flat disc of metal or stone thrown as an exercise of strength of skill, spec. in mod. use a heavy flattish ring of iron, slightly convex on the upper side and concave on the under, so as to give it an edge capable of cutting into the ground when it falls, if skilfully thrown Also the ring of rope used in deck-quoits'; of its etymology the NED (s v *quoit*) remarks. "Of obscure etym.; the variation of form between *coit*, *quait*, *quait* prob. indicates a Fr. origin. Derivation from OF *coitner*, *quaitner* 'to prick, spur, incite, hasten' has been suggested, but it does not appear that this vb had also the sense 'to throw, hurl' . . ." I would suggest the same etymon as that of *quilt* which once meant, not only 'coverlet' but also different kinds of 'pads' or 'cushions'. OF. *coite*, mod Fr. *couette* (< Lat. *culcita*). 'Padding' is a cheating trick, as is *cogging*.

(the flat) surreptitiously when palmed," hence (1584) 'to practise roguery, to cheat' and 'to introduce surreptitiously' (1563-87), 'to palm off' (1599), 'to cut a pocket' (slang 1585).

—and on the other hand *to foust* 'to break wind silently' is related by the NED with *to fist* and those onomatopoeas which Wedgwood assumed to be the basis of the two homonymous verbs

It is evident that the Dutch term (which has no early attestation) is not semantically fitting, and offers no parallel to Eng. *to palm off* to guess at the numbers of coins hidden in another's hand, nor to hide coins in one's hand to make another guess—neither of these is to cheat, to introduce surreptitiously etc. And the German *fausten*, *fausten* had never any other meaning but 'in die faust nehmen,' 'zugreifen, hand anlegen,' 'prügeln und fechten,' 'mit der faust stossen' (DWb.). But there exists, in French, a verb which is excellently appropriate since it is precisely a term from the slang of sharpers. "*fustiller c'est changi[er les dez]*" is an entry in the dictionary appended to the document concerned with the trial of the gangsters called *coquillards* in 1455 (Sainéan, *Les sources de l'argot ancien* I, 46 and II, 356), and *affûter* 'tromper' is attested in the *argot ancien* since 1660 (*ibid.*), *affûter* 'to cheat' exists today in the Parisian argot (cf. *homme d'affût* 'rusé' in academic French, Canadian *affûts* 'ruses, dissimulations'). The FEW s. v. *fûstus* 'stock, stange' explains the semantic development of OE. *affuster* (12th c.) 'to provide with a handle' > 'to prepare for use, to frame' > 'to sharpen' (*affûter les outils* 'aiguiser,' since 1680). The development 'to cheat' (in the argot) can, according to the FEW, start either from 'to prepare for use' (ironical) or from 'to sharpen' (sharpening and flattening being practices familiar to cheaters in dicing). for the latter cf. Eng. *sharp(er)* (attested 1881), dial. Fr. *aiguiser* 'tromper.' As for the Fr. *fûté* 'rusé,' this had the meaning in the 16th cent. of 'harassed, tired' (in Math. Régnier), which we must connect with the data of modern dialect dictionaries. Centre *fûteux* 'fûté, rusé, fin, adroit. Se dit principalement des chasseurs habiles' (Jaubert), Anjou *fûter* 'se dit le Poiseau qui s'échappe du bois, c-à-d. de la trappe; de là l'expression *fûté fin rusé*' (Verrier-Onillon); Sain-tonge *fûter* 'faire venir à l'appau le gibier et ne pouvoir ou ne vouloir le prendre. Cette dernière façon est celle des chasseurs qui veulent rendre impuissants les pièges des braconniers' (Jônain). A *oiseau fûté* is, then, a bird harassed by hunters and, since it has

escaped the trap, one who has become experienced and cunning. Thus it is possible that *fûté* is derived from OF. *fuster* 'to beat,' 'to pillage, devastate' (cf. *rebattu* 'tired'), which itself is a French formation from *fustus* (like Lat. *fustigare*). The dicing term—a third possibility, in addition to the two mentioned by the FEW—may also be derived from the *fûter* of the hunters (cf., likewise, *être à l'affût* 'to lie in ambush'). Whatever the semantic origin of the former, it is evident that Eng. *to foist*, a dicing term, goes back to *fustiller*, a dicing term. The fact that as early as 1455 a *fustiller* is to be found, shows clearly that a *fuster* in the same meaning must have been in existence much earlier. The Eng. -oi- instead of Fr. -u- (as in *recoil* < *reculer*) is attested in the same word family in *foist*, *fust* 'galley, barge' (whose recognized etymon is OF. *fust*, Fr. *fût* 'ship'),¹¹ and in *foist* 'a cask for wine' = OF. *fust*, Fr. *fût* 'cask' and *foisty*, *fusty* 'musty, mouldy' (originally 'smelling like a wine cask') = M. Fr. *futé* '(vin, cidre) qui sent le fût' all of which go back ultimately to Lat. *fustus*.

6 GRAY. This word, according to the NED, is attested as early as 1390 in the cookery book *Form of Cury*:

Connynges in Gravey Take Connynges . and drawe him with a gode broth with almandes blanchyd and brayyd, do perinne suger and powder gynger

Oysters in Gravey Schyl Oysters and seep hem in wyne and in hare own broth, cole the broth through a cloth, take almandes blaunched, grynde them and drawe hem up with the self broth & alye it wip flour of Rys and do the oysters perinne, cast in powder of gynger, sugar, maecys

It meant originally 'some kind of dressing used for white meats, fish, and vegetables, which seems to have consisted of broth, milk of almonds, spices, and (usually) wine or ale.' As regards the etymology of our word the NED says:

Of obscure origin

The receipts quoted under sense 1 below are substantially identical with receipts in OF cookery books, in which the word is *grané*. For the OF word the reading *grané* seems certain . . . it is probably cogn. with OF. *gram* 'anything used in cooking' (Godef.) . . . But in the Eng. MSS the word has nearly always either a *v*, or a letter which looks more like

¹¹ Cf. A. Western, *Englische Studien*, XLII, 267. This scholar connects the verb *to foist* with OE *fyst* 'fist' (rather than with Dutch *vuisten*). For the semantic reasons pointed out in the text I consider Fr. **fuster* preferable.

u than n . As the ME word was therefore identical in form with the mod word, it seems difficult, in spite of the difference in sense, to regard them as unconnected. In the present state of the evidence, the most probable conclusion is that the OF *grané* was early misread as *gravé*, and in that form became current as a term of English cookery.

It is quite true, as the NED states, that the French recipes as listed by Godefroy s. v. *grané* correspond exactly to those found in English cookery books cf. for example Taillevent, *le Viandier* (end of the 14th cent.):

Pour faire grané de poisson, de brochet ou de carpe, ou aultre poisson, escallez et frisez le poisson, faites hasler du pain et tremper en puree de poix, et coulez, et y mettez de l'ongnon fricassé, trenché assez gros, et mettez bouillir ensemble gingembre, canelle et menues especes, et les defaictes de vinaigre, et y mettez ung peu de safran pour le coulourer ¹²

As regards the form of the OF. word, however, the NED has trusted Godefroy over much in assuming the existence of an OF. *grané*; and this assumption has led them to make the further suggestion, which must be suspect, that we have to do with a misreading, on the part of the English, of the French cookery term—and consequently of a 'spelling pronunciation' (or rather 'mis-spelling pronunciation'). This is a hypothesis of despair: why assume that a term used by cooks was a word of the cookery books and not a part of the living speech used by members of this profession? ¹³

Actually it is an OF. *gravé* alone which can be the origin of Eng. *gravy*. And the fact that out of the six passages cited by Godefroy, he has corrected in three of them a printed *gravé* into a *grané* which he thought to have found in the other three ¹⁴—this should have

¹² A similar dish was also called *blanc mangier* 'espèce de gelée dans laquelle il entre du lait et des amandes' (cf. the more detailed recipe listed by Godef., *Compl.* from Taillevent, and the one in the cookery book edited by Douet-D'Arq l c p 221); from this were derived O Ital *bramangiere* (Tomm-Bellini), Eng. *blancmange* and MHG *blamensier*, *mensier blâ*, *flemenscher* (Schulz, *Das höfische Leben* I, 392). The 14th cent. treatise edited by Douet-D'Arq has also the name *blanc douchet* (< *dous*).

¹³ It may be noted that in the cookery book edited by Douet-D'Arq which we shall discuss later the admonition to good cooks suggests, in the first place, that they should memorize their recipes:

Quiconques veut servir en bon oste, il doit avoir tout ce qui est en cest roulle escrit en son cuer, ou en escrit sus soi.

¹⁴ In making such a correction he had a predecessor in Douet-D'Arq,

aroused the suspicions of the editors of the NED. In the very first attestation cited by Godefroy, a passage taken from the treatise of Walter de Bibbesworth (written 1280-90), v. 1114, we find:

Puis [at the end of the sample meal] averent coins *en gravé*
[variant Au tercez cours avient conins *en gravé*]

This verse is glossed by the most recent ms in English (ms. O): *conynges gravy*. According both to the older edition of Wright and to the careful re-edition by a pupil of Mario Roques, Miss Annie Owen ("Le traité de W. de B. sur la langue française," Paris 1929), not one of the mss. of this text has the form *grané*; Miss Owen not only has *gravé* in the critical text but also includes it in her glossary, with the translation 'sorte de ragoût.' This, the first attestation of *gravé* is in perfect harmony with the English gloss *gravy*—a harmony which it would be unthinkable to destroy.

Moreover, the etymology of the pseudo-*grané* as offered by the NED has little plausibility: *grané* from *grain* 'tout ce qu'on peut employer en cuisine.' This *grain*, according to the evidence, appears in only one text, Taillevent, where it occurs several times:

Bouli lardé. Prenes votre grain et le lardes . . Brouet de verjus.
Prenes votre poulaille ou autre grain. Rappe Metes vostre grain
frrire . .

This *grain* must mean simply 'stuff, item'; such a generic expression could hardly have led to a *grané* ('a dish made with stuff?'), for our term of cookery must have referred to a specific dish made with specific ingredients (like *civé* with which it is coupled in one

the editor of a cookery book of the 14th cent. in *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes* 21 (1860), which contains a recipe for *menus oiseaux* approximately identical with that of Taillevent; Douet-D'Arcq also, and in a manner reminiscent of the NED, justifies his reading *grane*

Grane de menus oiseaux. On trouve ce plat dans Taillevent, mais en poisson: *grane de loche, grane de perche.* Dans le *Ménagier de Paris* [a. 1393], il est écrit *grave* et *gravé*. Nous préférons la forme *grane*, parce qu'elle se rapproche plus de *grain*, qui, dans Taillevent, semble désigner indifféremment tout ce qu'on peut employer en cuisine [follows the text mentioned above which Godef. has under *grain*]

It seems evident from the wording of this passage that the editor has corrected a *grane*, which he must have found in the ms., into *grane*—and this only because of his own etymological bias. It is quite probable that a closer inspection of manuscripts would, in all the passages hitherto listed, yield a *grane* to be read *gravé*. *Habent sua fata—lectiones!*

of the examples cited by Godefroy [*au civé ou au gravé*] and which means 'a dish with onions' [**cep-atus*], cf. also OF. *cominée de galines* 'a ragoût with cummin' = **cumin-ata* note the numerous names of dishes in *-ée, -ade* [*aillée-aillade*] in French).

What then is this OF. *gravé* of 1280-90 which we may now accept as representing the etymon of Eng. *gravy*? In seeking to analyze the practical significance of the term, I would emphasize, in contrast to the NED, the particular ingredient *deffaictes de vinaigre* mentioned in one of the recipes. There is an OF. *gravelle* 'tartre de lie de vin desséchée' (*tartre, c'est gravelle de vin, Grant Herbier*); a medieval Latin *gravella vinorum* 'Vappa, vinum vapidum, Gall *Vin poussé*' (Du Cange), in Central French dialects a *gravelle* 'lie sèche' (Jaubert, *Compl.*). All of these terms belong to Gaulish *grava* 'pebble-stone' (> Fr. *grève* 'river sand,' *gravelle*, 'gravel' etc.), REW 3851.¹⁵ One may assume in OF. the simplex **grève* with the meaning of *gravelle*, but since this meaning has not been attested I can offer this suggestion simply as a suggestion.

¹⁵ Another way to combine *gravé* with the *grava* word-family would be to emphasize the *granulation* of the ingredients entering into the *ragoût*—keeping in mind such semantic developments as OF. *gravillon* 'pépité,' Cent Fr. *gravouilles, gravouilles* 'grenailles,' *grave, graviau, gravelle* 'grain de sable' (1 e 'small grains').

There are, according to REW 3875, vestiges of a Germ *gruoba* to be found in Swiss Romance dialects with the meaning 'tartre de vin,' 'petit morceau du résidu de la graisse fondue,' v. Pierrehumbert, *Dict hist du patois neuchâtelois* s. vv. *grabon* (*greubon, grebon*) and *greube* (*groube*). It is to be noted, however, that the geographic area of these forms is far removed from the usual dialectal centers from which words are wont to pass over to English; moreover these words contain only a medial -b- (not -v-).

The *Universal Dict.* derives *gravy* from *graves, greaves* which in turn go back to the Scandinavian or Low German representatives of Germ *Grieben*. The etymology proposed takes no account whatsoever of the connection, which cannot be doubted, between *gravy* and OFr. *gravé*.

G. Tilander, *Glanures lexicographiques* (Lund 1932) p. 135 quotes another *grane d'Espagne* 'espèce de potage' from 2 mss. of the *Livre des deduits* of Gace de la Buigne (14th c.); he believes the *gravé* forms to be erroneous, and explains *grané* from *gram* "la partie solide d'un mets composé de solide et de liquide." But how to explain the *v-* form in Walther of Bibbesworth, and the *-v-* of Eng. *gravy*? The latter as a wrong spelling pronunciation? But this would be an alteration unparalleled in English (the only comparable case is Eng. *bunnaole* from Fr. *habitaole*—but here the influence of *bin, pinnaole* etc. is obvious).

7. JAUNT. According to the NED the original meaning, now obsolete, of this noun is 'a fatiguing or troublesome journey', it is in this meaning that it is first attested in 1592 in *Romeo and Juliet*.

Lord how my bones ake

Fie what a *jaunt* (var. *jaunce*) have I had.

The meaning prevalent today, 'an excursion, a trip or journey, esp. one taken for pleasure' is not attested until 1678—the parallel meaning of the verb *to jaunt*, not until 1647. This verb, in the meaning 'to make (a horse) prance up and down, to exercise or tire a horse by riding him up and down,' is attested earlier than is the noun: 1570, Googe ". . . Saint Stephens day, whereon doth every man His horses jaunt and course abrode, as swiftly as he can", connected meanings of this verb are 'to prance' (attested 1598), 'to carry up and down on a prancing horse, to "cart about" in a vehicle' (1574), 'of a person to trot or trudge about (with the notion of exertion or fatigue); to run to and fro' (attested 1575).

As regards the etymology of the verb the NED remarks: "Of obscure origin, in 1 ['to make a horse prance'] it appears to be more or less identical in sense with *Jaunce* v.; but the phonetic relation is obscure." The verb *to jaunce* 'to make (a horse) prance up and down, to prance as a horse' is now obsolete; it is first attested in Shakespeare, *Rich. II: jauncing Bolingbroke* etc., cf. the noun *jaunce* in the variant quoted above from *Romeo and Juliet* which may possibly be "a scribal error or misprint for *jaunt*" (NED). Of the etymology of *jaunce* the NED tells us:

prob derived from OF.

Palsgrave has 'I gestyll a horse to and fro in the stabyll, *Je jancee*. He has gestyllled my horse in the stabyll tyll he hath made him all on a water: *il a janoée mon cheual a lestable tant quil la mys tout en eaue*' Cotgrave has '*lancer un cheval*, to stirre a horse in the stable till hee sweat withall; or (as our) to jaunt, (an old word)' Neither of these writers uses the Eng *jaunce* to render *jancer*, nor is the sense assigned by them that of Shaks. But Palsgr has 'I gawance a horse up and downe upon the stones and make him gambalde and flynge, *je pourcoondis*. And you gaunce your horse up and downe thus upon the stones, he will be naught within a while: *si vous pourbondissiez cheval en ce poynt*;' (OF. *pourbondir* = *caracoler* and *faire caracoler*, Godef.). This *gaunce* or *gawnce* appears to agree in meaning with Shakspeare's *jaunce*, but hardly with *jancer*, as explained by Palsgr. and Cotgr. If the words are the same, the only possible inference seems to be that there was an OF **jancer* (? ONFr. **gancer*) to prance as

a horse, to make a horse prance, the existence of which is as yet known only from Palsgr. and Cotgr (both Englishmen) who perhaps did not clearly understand its meaning. See also *Jounce* v

Under *Jounce* vb we read:

Of obscure origin it has been compared to *Jaunce* v, which it partly approaches in use, but with which it can scarcely be phonetically connected. Several words in *-ounce*, as *bounce*, *pounce*, *trounce*, are of obscure history.

This verb is attested as early as c. 1440 (*iowncyng* translating *strepitus* and interpreted by 'great ungente moving'), in the meaning referring to rough riding it turns up in 1581 (*set him—upon a trotting iade to iounce him thoroughly*).

I see no reason for doubting the statements of the two English lexicographers who have proved generally to be so conscientious, and indeed, at the date of the publication of the volume of the NED that contains *jaunce* (1901) there was already at hand information which could have indicated to the editors that the existence of an OF *jancer un cheval* 'to make a horse prance' is not to be excluded. In Godefroy s. v. *jancer* (vol. 4, 1885) the citation from Palsgrave is to be found in an article presented as follows

Jancer, v a, balayer.

Le sacristain de l'abbaye de Montierneuf était tenu "de jancer l'église toutesfoiis qu'il en estoit mestier" (1479, . *Arch. Vienne*)

— Etriller [then follows the Palsgr passage]

Aunis, Poitou, *jancer*, *joncer*, balayer

The item immediately following reads:

Janceure, s. f. balayure [with a passage extracted from the same Archives of the Dept. Vienne from which Godef. had quoted *jancer*]

Dans plusieurs localités de la Vienne et des Deux-Sèvres, on dit encore *geonçures* pour balayures. "O n'faut poué quitté qui les *geonçures* d'la place." Il ne faut point laisser là les balayures de la chambre.

And in Mistral's dictionary of modern Provençal (1878-86) we read:

Gensa. Agencer, embellir, orner, dans les Alpes, v *agensa*; nettoyer, balayer en Lamoignon . . . , dauber, dompter, en Languedoc, v *soubé* [this synonym is defined 'dauber, frapper, battre, maltraiter, rosser . . . haler un chien'].

Gensado. Ce qu'on balaye en une fois

The meaning 'to sweep' must be old in Provençal although Levy

(*Prov. Suppl.*, -*Wb.* and *Petit dict.*) gives the verb only with the meanings 'embellir, orner,' 'être beau, briller'; for the meaning 'to exercise ('break in'—*dompter*) a horse,' which today appears only in Languedoc, this must once have been much more widespread since it came to Palsgrave's attention—who can hardly have been familiar with Languedocian. At any rate we have evidence that his remark, questioned by the NED, is correct.

Now OF. *jancer*, O. Prov. **gensar* 'to sweep,' '*to tame' are evidently related to Fr. *agencer*, Prov. *agensar* which we find listed in the REW s. v. *gens*—these last verbs are derived from the OF., O. Prov. adjective *gen(t)* 'pretty, nice' which Meyer-Lübke¹⁶ explains by reference to *homo gentis* 'a member of a (good) family' and Bloch-von Wartburg, more convincingly, as derived from Lat. *genitus* 'well-born, noble', however this may be, an **ad-gen(i)t-iar*e or **ad-gent-iar*e would give the OF. *agencier* 'to arrange' (variant *agencur*). This idea of 'arrangement' must be basic to all our forms. *Jancer*, then, would represent a semantic development of the original meaning of the verb (a)*gencier* 'to arrange': this meaning could lead both to 'to sweep, to clean' (cf. the sentence in old Catalanian attested by the *Diccionari Aguiló*: '[good language] virtuts es preciosa qui *agença*, obra et *munda*') and 'to season, to tame' (as in Languedocian). Cf. the semantic development of **affactare* 'to arrange, to prepare' (FEW s. v.) in French: OF. *affaitier* 'arranger, parer avec recherche; apprivoiser,'¹⁷ Namur *afaiti*

¹⁶ Meyer-Lübke writes. "afz. *agencier*, nfrz. *agencir* 'herrichten,' poit. saint. 'kehren'" Only in OF. is there an *agencur*. the mod Fr. verb is *agencer*, moreover OF. *agencur* had the exclusive meaning 'to adorn'; only *gencer* means 'to sweep' Poitou and Saintonge. Thus his passage should be corrected to read:

afz. *agencier*, nfrz. *agencer* 'herrichten'; afz. *agencir* 'schmücken'; afz., poit. saint. *jancer* 'kehren'

That *agencer*, not *jancer*, has survived in mod. Fr. may be due to the attraction of the former by the word-family *agent* (>*agens*), *agence*. Pichon, *Le fr. mod.* VIII, 122 says of contemporary French: "Dans le sentiment linguistique des Français, *agencer* s'amarre à *agence*, qui s'amarre à *agent*." Cf. what happened to OF. *abillier* 'to prepare' (= *a-bill-ier*) which alone survived (while *billier* perished) because it was attracted by *habiti*: hence *habiller* 'to clothe'

¹⁷ The well-known development of OF. *affaitier* 'to arrange' > O. Sp. *afeitar* 'to adorn,' mod. Sp. 'to arrange one's hair, to shave' is paralleled by *agencer ses cheveux* often attested in 16th cent. French; cf. "Non autrement Adon mignardant sa Venus se pâme de plaisir, lors que ses cheveux nus Decoiffée elle agence en plaisante merveille," Baif, *apud* Huguet.

'accoutumer.' Norm. *afféter* 'assaisonner,' Dauphiné *afacha* 'vaner, cribler nettoyer' Jujurieux (Ain) *afètyé* 'balayer', OF. *afatable* 'qui peut être dressé,' *afatié* 'habile, instruit, accoutumé, dressé'

The development in the same general direction of the idea of 'tamelessness' is perhaps illustrated in the intransitive use of OF *agenci(e)r* cf. Gunnar Tülander, *Lexique du Roman de Renart*, p. 8 on the Renart passage. *Et con il vit qu'il volt tencher, Si commença a agencier*:

Godefroy enregistre ce passage disant: "Le mot *agencier* semble signifier prendre des manières plus douces" Cf cet ex de *agensir* chez God Puis devient net et agensis Tout pour li plaire Le roi voulait d'abord acquitter Renart, mais quand il voit que Ys [engrin] se met en colère, il commence a agencier "devient plus gentil, plus juste" Tobler Wb [= Tobler-Lommatzsch] traduit 'nachgeben, sich fügen'¹⁸

It is also possible, however, that this intransitive *agenci(e)r*, in harmony with the meaning of the adjective *gent* 'nice,' could have directly developed the meaning 'to become agreeable'—without passing through the stages 'to arrange, to tame' > 'to become tame, docile.'

Since in Western French dialects the verb *joncer* is to be found as a phonetic variant of *jancer*, it may be upon this that is derived the Eng. *to jounce*, which once meant the same as *to jaunce*. 'to make a horse prance.' Or, it is possible to assume a blend of *jaunce* with one of the *-ounce* verbs mentioned by the NED. Or, simply a phonetic shift *aun* > *-oun-* in Eng., cf. van der Gaaf, *Eng. St.* xv, 171. The *-au-* development¹⁹ in *to jaunce* is parallel

¹⁸ Cf. also the following passage from Chrestien's *Cligés* which contains *agencier* (though the reading of the end of the word is doubtful there is no question about the verb itself). [Gauvain] *de quanqu'il puet, s'ajancist* [variant *s'ajancee*] *De bel joster* Breuer in his *Worterbuch* of Chrestien translates 'sich fein benehmen, sich anstrengen,' but the verb could also be interpreted 'to adjust, adapt oneself to the code of honor.' And surely 'to adjust' is the right translation for the passage from *Eraclus* (cited by Tobler-Lommatzsch): *A deu s'afaita (') e agencist Qui felon home adevancist* ('he adjusts himself to the will of God') From this meaning 'to adjust' is evidently derived Guernesey *se gençaîr* 'se mettre de côté, faire place' (*gençage* 'lieu où l'on se met de côté, largisse'), cf the dictionary of Métivier.

¹⁹ How are the forms *guvance*, *gaunce* in Palsgrave to be explained? As hyper-correct pronunciations shaped after the pattern standard Fr. *jaune*—Norm *gaune* (cf Eng *gaunt* 'lean' = OF *jaunet*), *jai-gaol*? Or,

to that illustrated by the later *gentil* > *jaunty* (as opposed to the development of Normandian *gentle*, dialectal *gentee* etc.) How is to be explained the *-t-* of Eng. *jaunt*? Although the verb is attested (slightly) earlier than the noun we must infer that the latter is the older form: an Eng. verb *jaunt* could never be derived from Fr. *jancer*, but it is quite possible to explain a noun *jaunt* by reference to a Fr. **janz* (= a postverbal substantive which, though unattested, may easily be assumed—and which indeed may have survived in the Eng. noun *jaunce*). For, as is well known, final *-z* in OF. lent itself to a false resolution into *-t-* + *-s*; for example, since *amanz* had the oblique case *amant* it was possible for *esfort*, a postverbal noun formed from *esforcier* (**esfort-iare*) to receive an oblique case *esfort*, which has survived in Fr. *effort*, Eng. *effort* (the Eng. noun *efforce* is only sporadically present in 16th cent. English), cf. above, *culprit*. Thus from an OF. **janz* there could have been extracted a 'false' oblique case **jant*—which gives us our Eng. noun *jaunt*.²⁰

And so we see that the word family *jaunce-jaunt* has been borrowed from French, along with other words of the *manège* (e.g. that *gambol* = Fr. *gambade* with which our verb is coupled by Palsgrave, 1530).

Vivant Palsgravius et Cotgravius revindicati!

8. RUM. The *Universal Dict of the Eng. Language* gives the

since the spelling *gaol* tended to be pronounced *jail*, as a wrong spelling for *jaunce*? At any rate we shall not assume an Anglo Norman **gancier* as does (tentatively) the NED

²⁰ One might, in order to explain the Eng. verb *jaunt*, have recourse to the OF. *agentir* 'to adorn' attested by Godefroy, this supposedly is a derivative from *gent* 'pretty'. This would offer several difficulties, however one would be forced to assume a development of meaning along the lines of 'to arrange, to tame', and for this there is no evidence. Indeed, Tobler-Lommatzsch seem to believe that the form *agentir* represents simply a scribal error, a misreading for *agencir*; they fail to list any such verb, and they correct one of the Godefroy passages with *agenti* (*ou corage agenti*) to read *agenci*. Moreover, even if *agentir* existed, it is a rule that OF verbs in *-ir* have generally developed the suffix *-ish* in English: *brandir*, *blandir* > *brandish*, *blandish*.—Weekley posits OF. *jambeter* > *jaunt* of which *jaunce* would be a "corruption due to E. fondness for this ending" (it would be better then to assume a **jamb-asser* as the etymon of *jaunce*)—but this hypothesis would disrupt the ties between OF *jancer un cheval* and *jaunce, jaunt*.

following explanation (quoted from *Academy*, September 5, 1885) of the word *rum*.

Mr N Darnell Davis has put forth a derivation of the word *rum* which gives the only probable history of it. It came from Barbadoes, where the planters first distilled it, somewhere between 1640 to 1645. A MS *Description of Barbadoes*, in Trinity College, Dublin, written about 1651, says 'The chief fudling they make in the island is *rumbullion*, alias Kill-Devil, and this is made of sugar canes distilled, a hot, hellish and terrible liquor.' G Warren's *Description of Surinam*, 1661, shows the word in its present short form. '*Rum* is a spirit extracted from the juice of sugar-canes called Kill-Devil in New England.' '*Rumbullion*' is a Devonshire word, meaning 'a great tumult,' and may have been adopted from some of the Devonshire settlers in Barbadoes, at any rate, little doubt can exist that it has given rise to our word *rum*, and the longer name *rumbowling*, which sailors gave to their grog.

The NED adopts this explanation with some hesitancy "of obscure origin: perhaps an abbreviation of the longer forms *Rumbullion* or *Rumbustion*, which are found a little earlier": *rumbustion* is in fact found in 1652 in *Mercurius Pohticus* in the following sentence

Partly [through] the Brandewin wherewith we have furnisht him, the spirits of Rombostion, which our man there make him, and other good hopes we give him, he becomes very valiant

On the other hand we find in the German etymological dictionary of Kluge-Götze the statement: "Um die Herkunft streiten Ost- und Westindien"; Kluge-Götze quote here textually from Littmann, *Morgenländische Wörter im Deutschen*, p. 131, who goes on to say: "Wer es aus Ostindien ableitet, nimmt an, dass von dem malayischen Worte *beram* 'Rauschtrauk' das *be-* abgefallen sei, das ist eine gewisse Schwierigkeit, aber die Herleitung aus Barbados ist auch nicht einfacher." But it is evidently the lexicographers of the NED who are on the right track, I see no difficulty against accepting their *rumbullion* (and *rumbustion*), since they are attested earlier than the short form *rum*; such an abbreviation would be parallel to *punch* from *puncheon* in the sailors' language (cf. NED, which discards the etymology, upheld as late as 1921 in Dalgado's *Dicc. luso-asíatica*, of a Hindu word meaning 'five [elements]') and to *grog* from *grogram* (< Fr *gros grain*), incidentally *punch* was also used in Barbados in reference to a sort of rum (NED, anno 1657).

But what is this Devonshire *rumbullion*, which means not only a 'hellish drink,' but also 'uproar, great tumult'? In my opinion

it is an English dialectal word originating in French, in fact a derivative from *bouillon* (to which Weekley once referred in his tentative explanation of *rumbullion* as equivalent to *rum* 'good' + Fr. *bouillon* 'hot drink'). Now *rum* is distilled "from the fermented skimmings of the sugar-boilers and molasses, together with sufficient cane juice to impart the necessary flavor" (*Univ. Dict.*); and a *rebulhir* 'to ferment' (FEW s. v. *bullire*, I, 622) has been developed, for example in the South of France, from the word family *rebouiller* 'to boyle once more, or over again, or boyle the second time,' *rebouillonner* 'to bubble, surge, or wamble often, or over again' (Cotgrave). thus *rumbullion* is a **rebouillon* or **rembouillon* (cf. Vaudouix *rembouyener* 'se dit d'une soupe ou d'un mets que l'on réchauffe . . .' FEW; popular French in general has a tendency to replace the prefix *re-* by *ren-*. *remplacer*, *rendoubler*, *retraire* for *re-placer*, *-doubler*, *-traire*, Brunot, *Hist. d. l. lang. fr.* x, 137). As for the other meaning of *rumbullion* ('tumult'), we find that in French *bouillonner*, *bouillonnement* are still said of an 'ebullition of passion'; thus it is possible that *rumbullion*, in the language of sailors, meant originally both 'uproar, tumult' and 'distillation from fermented skimmings'—without the one being necessarily prior to the other.

The variant *rumbustion* is evidently influenced by the ending of *combustion* 'violent excitement or commotion, disorder, confusion, tumult, hubbub,' which, according to the NED, was "excessively common in 17th and 18th c.," cf. the adjective (attested 1594) *combustious* 'raging, tumultuous, turbulent, stormy'; these compare directly with *rumbustious* 'boisterous, turbulent, unruly, uproarious' (attested 1778) and *rumbustical* (1795). The part played by *robust*(*ic*), *robustious* in this development is only secondary, the main source is surely *rumbustion* = *rumbullion* + *combustion*. Once this contamination had come about, the comic spirit of English indulged in all kinds of caricaturesque formations: the influence of learned words such as *presumption* made possible a **rumgumption*, the existence of which is indicated by *rumgumptionious* (att. 1781) 'violent, bold, rash,' and probably also by Scotch and Northern dialectal Eng. *rumgumption* (att. 1770), *rumblegumption* (att. 1787—hence the abbreviation *gumption*, att. 1719, first in Scotch, rhyming with *presumption*), these dialectal words, meaning 'common sense, mother wit, shrewdness' must have referred originally to "‘rough common sense’" (which is Wright's transla-

tion for *rumgumption*): i. e. to the self-assertive variant of common sense, in dialects *gumption* also means 'impertinence, petty insolence of speech'—a confirmation of our assumption. There may also have existed a **rumbumption* parallel to *rumgumption* > *gumption*, and have given (**bumption-*) *bumptious* 'offensively self-concerned, self-assertive' (19th c) which, according to the NED, should be derived from *bump* (coined after the pattern of *fractious*, *captious*). Finally we should mention the colloquial American *rambunctious* 'mischievous, energetic, self-assertive,' which, in the words of Mencken (*The American Language*, p. 568), marks "the final step in a process which began with *robustious* and ran through *rumbustious* and *rambustious* before Americans took a hand in it", I would trace this back to a blend of *robustious*, *rumbustion*, *rumgumption*, with another facetious learned ending *-unctious-ion* (of *unctuous-unction?*), instead of *-umption* *-umptious*.

There may also have existed a **ru(m)gumption*, 'rum,' ultimately going back to *rumbustion*, *rumbullion*, at least this would be a satisfactory etymon for the French argot term, hitherto unexplained, *rogomme* 'liqueur forte' (first attested in 1700 with Mme de Maintenon; *rogum*). Such a development would be parallel to other borrowings in French from English, such as *rum* in 1688 (Blome), mod. Fr. *rhum*, and Fr. *guldive* (1722, with Father Labat),²¹ which the Romance etymological dictionaries list as unexplained (v. Dauzat), but which the NED has correctly traced back to *kill-devil* (this in turn is a semantic parallel to French argot words for 'rum' or 'whiskey,' such as *casse-poitrine*, *tord-boyaux*, *paffe*).

²¹ This same Labat gives us the first attestation of the word *tafia*: "Les sauvages et les nègres l' [la *guldive*] appellent *tafia*" The NED suggests Malay *táfia*; but how then could we explain the Fr form *ratafia* (*ratafié* in Ménage), which is found earlier (in Bouleau, 1694)? I would tentatively suggest a Fr. dialectal word **ratafiard* or **ratafias* from *ratefier*, OF. *atefier* 'croître, pousser' (in dialectal Fr 'nourrir, munir, planter, façonner, ajuster'; cf *ratyer* 'replanter, repousser,' FEW), which goes back to Latin *apifyicare*; in this way 'rum' would have been conceived as something which gives new strength to life (cf *eau-de-vie*). *Tafia* (if it really comes from the savages and not from the French sailors—cf the popular French abbreviations of the type *chandail* < *marchand d'ail*) would then be a secondary alteration of *ratafia*.

9. TRANCE-PRANCE. The now obsolete verb *trance* 'to move about actively or briskly, to prance or skip . . .', listed by the NED as *trance* vb 2 (cf. also the item *trounce*),²² is of unknown origin. In my opinion this verb, which is first attested in Chaucer, in a none too clear context,²³ and in Gower, is related to the Fr. *trémousser*: *trémousser quelqu'un* 'lui donner du mouvement, de l'activité (Voltaire: *Cette voiture est spécifique/Pour trémousser et secouer/Un bourgmestre apoplectique*); *se trémousser* 'se remuer, s'agiter d'un mouvement vif et irrégulier' (Molière: *ces gens-là [dancers] se trémoussent bien*); *trémousser* (intr.) used only of minimum movement, e.g. the quivering of a bird (Cotgrave. 'To tremble, shroud, shiver, quake extremely, or upon an extreme fear'). The best explanation of this verb is that given by Sainéan, *Les sources de l'étymologie indigène* II, 334, and accepted by REW (8877) *trémousser* is derived from the noun **tremousse* which is itself a blend of *trémour* (< *tremor*) + *secousse* (< *succussare*) I would assume a French form **trem'ser*,²⁴ which could have led to Eng *trance*, *trounce*, according to the development -em- > -am- (originally -ām-),²⁵ as we find it in Fr. *femme*, *ramer*, OF. *tameur* (< *timere*).²⁶

* * * * *

²² This verb is a variant of *trance* vb 2, just as is the other *trounce* (< Fr. *transir*) of *trance* vb 1 'to pass away, to die, to be in great fear', cf. also the pair *jaunce-jounce*.

²³ 'There was no more to spoken [v w. *skipen*, *schepe*] nor to traunce [Ms Harley *taunce*],' *Troilus* III, 690; Skeat translates 'tramping about' (said of the attendants).

²⁴ For the dropping of the pretonic vowel cf. Eng *trapsee* (*trapse*) from OF. *trapasser* (*trespasser*).

²⁵ The nasalization of the vowel before an intervocalic nasal in OF. accounts for the shift *m's* > *ns*, which is parallel to that of *m* in immediate contact with -s-: *redemptio* > OF. *raenson*, Eng *ransom*. In a *trām'ser* the -m- had a good chance of becoming homorganic to -s-, i.e. of being changed to -n-. That this did not happen with *fumsy* (< *phlegmasie*, *phlegmasie*) is due to the fact that it was borrowed at a time when this nasalization was in regression.

A parallel development is perhaps preserved in the verb *flounce* 'to dash, plunge, rush' if this is a derivative from a Fr. **flamm-asse* or from *faumesche*, *flammeche* (< *falawiska*).

²⁶ I see an exact parallel to this development in the Fr. (argot) *clam(p)ser*, *crampser* (19th c.) 'to die', we may assume a noun **oremousse* = OF. *oremour* 'fear' (cf. Fr. *crandre* < *tremere* + *secousse*,

Of the verb *prance*, of unknown origin, attested with Chaucer 1376, the NED remarks:

The phonology and spelling of *praunse*, *pranse*, *prance*, suggest French origin, but no corresponding or allied verb is recorded in French [Danish and German dialectal analogies are offered tentatively, as is also a possible relationship with the verb *prank*]

The intransitive verb is attested with Gower, 1390 (*Whereof this man was wonder glad, And goth to prike and prance aboute*); the transitive, not until 1530 (Palsgrave: *I prounce a horse . . .*). I assume, however, that the meaning 'to make a horse prance' was the original, and I would connect trans. *prance* with the Picardian *plamuse* 'slap', this noun, which found its way into literary French (first attestation 1531), must go back, as Marchot (*Romania* XLVII, 236) suggested, to the Latin *palmizare* used by medieval clerics, we may assume the development *palmizare* > **palmeser* > **plamus(s)er*—whence was derived the postverbal *plamus(s)e*. A **plamusser son cheval* would mean originally 'to give a friendly slap to one's horse', echoes of this are to be seen in the sentence cited by Marchot from Théophile Gautier "*Le beau Salignac flattant (!) le col de son cheval avec des plamussades*", from this we come to the more specific idea 'to provoke a horse to prancing by a 'slap' with the flat of the hand.'²⁷ The form **plam'ser* would give our Eng. *prance*—the -r- being due to influence from the synonym *trance*.²⁸

with the original meaning 'the fearful last moments of agony') Compare also *claquer* 'to die' (I cannot share Dauzat's opinion that the Germ. *klapps* 'stroke' is the etymon of *clanser*—in spite of the variants *clapser*, *clapoter*, *claboter*; the original spelling must be that which is found in René Benjamin, *Gaspard*, p 101, and in Courteline, *Le tram de 8 h. 47*, II, 7 *clamecer*).

²⁷ The popular development of *palmizare* in French was *paumoyer*; *palmizare* itself must be a successor to the *colaphizare* used by ecclesiastical writers (cf. *colaphus* in the Bible).

²⁸ It is true that Sainéan, *Les sources indigènes* I, 239, connects *plamus(s)e* 'slap' (according to the semantic pattern 'cake' > 'slap') with the other *plamus(s)e* 'sorte de crêpe' which is attested only in Franche-Comté and is explained by Marchot as derived from MHG. *blatemuos* 'lagana'; the form *blamusse* 'slap' in Brantôme would speak in favor of Sainéan's theory, but the restricted area in which *plamus(s)e* 'cake' is attested speaks against it. Von Wartburg in his FEW has not listed *plamusse* 'slap' s. v. *blatemuos*; and, since he remarks on Franche-

10. TRUDGE. Of the verb *to trudge*, hitherto unexplained,²⁹ the first examples of the 16th c. show the forms *trudge*, *tridge* [rhyming with *bridge*], *tredge*. This last (which the NED lists without citing a text) leads us clearly to an OF. *triege*, *tria(1)ge* (12th c.), which Godefroy (who evidently has Lat. *trivium* in mind) translates as 'lieu où se croisent trois chemins, carrefour,' but which is more correctly interpreted by Jud (*Romania* XLVII, 497) as 'chemin, trace'; he mentions the use of this word in modern dialects in the meanings 'passage, trace,' 'passage étroit entre deux maisons,' 'trace de passage dans un champ ou dans une prairie'; he lists also the following verbs of modern dialects, derived from this same noun: Berry *triger* 'hanter, fréquenter,' 'faire la cour à une jeune fille'; Morvan *traier* 'aller çà et là, passer souvent dans le même endroit, fréquenter un lieu,' Besançon *tradgié* 'aller çà et là en s'arrêtant un peu partout'; all of these he connects with a Gaulish **trebium* 'passage, lane, between two houses,' from an attested *trebo* 'house, dwelling place, village' (cf. *A-tréb-ates* > *Arras*), **trebiare* 'to frequent.' From the meaning 'to go persistently (*fréquenter*),' there could easily have developed in English the meaning of tramping, walking laboriously, 'trudging.'

The *-u-* form of our English word may be due to the influence of *drudge* (with which *trudge* often occurs in rhyme: cf. examples in the NED): from the moment that *trudge* had come to mean 'to go heavily' it could be associated semantically with *drudge* (cf. the Eng. dialectal *trudge* in the meaning 'a hard worker, a drudge,' Wright).³⁰ As for the origin of *drudge* itself, this goes back (as

Comté *plamusse* 'crêpe'. "vielleicht ist die entlehnung auch nur modern" we may infer that he does not believe the identification proposed by Sainéan to be possible.

²⁹ According to Weekley, who offers examples from a text of 1547, the original meaning of *to trudge* is 'to start off'—in this way he would justify his identification of this verb with *truss*. But, from the evidence of the NED, it seems clear to me that such a meaning can be only secondary; the basic meaning must have been that which they propose: "to walk laboriously, wearily, or without spirit, but steadily and persistently, 'to jog on; to march heavily on' (Jamieson)." This could easily have led to a 'to march away,' 'to start off.'

³⁰ One could compare *triege* in Cotgrave 'strong, lustie, able-bodied' which must belong to our Fr. word-family (the etymon given by Cotgrave: from Sp *caballo de triego* is not plausible since *triego* is no Sp. form, as far as I know).

I shall show in *Rom. Rev.* 1944) to a dialectal Fr *druger* 'to run to and fro, to move briskly,' related to *indruticare* attested in Aldhelm,—and, ultimately, to Gaulish **drūto* Fr *diu* 'strong, vivacious' (cf FEW).

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

SMOLLETT AND THE ELDER PITT

Smollett's views on the elder Pitt have never been assembled or criticized by historians, or adequately dealt with by the biographers of either celebrity. My purpose is to present Smollett's attitudes toward Pitt expressed during a quarter of a century, including his long lost criticism which was published in *The Gazetteer and London Daily Advertiser* in 1762. From this scattered data his judgment of the great commoner can now be synthesized and shown to be, on the whole, surprisingly impartial and significant.

In his first poem, *Advice*, in 1746, Smollett exercised his irony on Pitt, stigmatizing him as "th' unshaken Abdiel yet unsung,"¹ and placing him in a rogues' gallery along with the Duke of Newcastle; the second Duke of Grafton, the Earl of Granville, leader of The Drunken Administration; the Earl of Bath, the third Earl of Cholmondeley, and the notorious Sir William Yonge. In his youthful poem Smollett was merely reflecting the sharp reaction against Pitt at that time, when as the result of a sudden reversal in his policy toward George II,² he became Paymaster and the object of a widely circulated satirical ballad, "The Unembarrassed Countenance."

As the years went by, Smollett recognized full well Pitt's honesty in financial matters and his other remarkable qualities as a national leader. Consequently he extolled him with what has the ring of real

¹ See Smollett's *Advice*, line 21.

² Pitt's change of policy has been summed up by a modern historian as follows: "Pitt himself unblushingly advocated the measures he had before denounced. A ballad 'The Unembarrassed Countenance' satirized the celerity of his conversion." (I. S. Leadam's *History of England from Anne to . . . George II*, London, 1909, p. 412, in *The Political History of England*, eds. Hunt and Poole, vol. ix.)

sincerity in the dedication of his *Complete History of England*, a tribute stressing Pitt's "shining talents," his integrity, and his defense of the British constitution. When Pitt read this truly magnificent dedication after opening the three sumptuous quarto volumes presented to him presumably in April, 1757,³ it is not strange that he wrote with what Smollett called "genuine politeness"⁴ the following note of acknowledgment.

Sir—

After a long disability from the gout in my right arm, I have a particular satisfaction in making this first use of my pen, to return you my best acknowledgments for the obliging favor you was so good to send me, and to express the sense I have of that undeserved opinion of me, which you have ventured to tell the world you are pleased to entertain. One of the first and most agreeable occupations of my summer's leisure, will be the perusal of your volumes, a work which, I doubt not will fully answer, with all good judges, the great expectations which the known talents of the writer have so justly raised.

I am, with great regard,

Sir,

Your most obedient

And, most humble

Servant,

W. Pitt⁵

Whitehall, May 15, 1757

Such was the pleasant relationship between the two in 1757. But within two years Smollett was suffering from alarmingly bad health, from frustrated efforts to secure a consulship at Madrid, and from the shadow of the approaching libel trial initiated by Admiral Knowles. Whether Pitt was approached by Wilkes⁶ as Smollett suggested in October, 1759, to effect a favorable type of trial we have no way of knowing, but it is clear that Smollett made unavailing efforts between 1758 and 1760, in Pitt's ministry, to get

³ On April 19, 1757, Garrick wrote to Smollett: "Mr. Rivington did me the favour to call upon me last week, & brought me your most obliging Present—" (letter in the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston). The obliging present was obviously a set of *The Complete History*, which Pitt should have received at about the same time.

⁴ See *Letters of Tobias Smollett*, ed. E. S. Noyes, Cambridge [Mass.], 1926, p. 47.

⁵ Quoted from *The Port Folio*, Philadelphia, I (Jan., 1801), p. 2, where Pitt's note was first printed, along with other letters to Smollett found in his trunk in Leghorn after the death of his widow, Ann Smollett.

⁶ See Smollett's *Letters*, p. 62.

a consulship at Madrid.⁷ In both of these attempts Pitt may or may not have been directly solicited by Smollett's friends. It is quite possible, too, that Smollett's being on trial for libel from June, 1759, to November, 1760, stood in the way of his obtaining the appointment. At any rate there is excellent evidence of Smollett's real view of Pitt at the end of 1759 in the following sentences from his letter to an unidentified friend in Jamaica.

The people here are in high spirits on account of our successes, and Mr Pitt is so popular, that I may venture to say all party is extinguished in Great Britain. That Minister is certainly in this respect the most surprising phenomenon that ever appeared in our hemisphere. If he had broke the spell by which we are bewitched to the continent, I would have pronounced him the greatest man that ever lived.⁸

Smollett's disapproval of Pitt's attitude toward the continental war is echoed in the dedication to him of *The British Magazine* which was probably composed by Smollett and which appeared in January, 1760. After praising Pitt's "incorruptible integrity" and his brilliant leadership in successful wars, the author of the dedication concluded:

We admire that resolution and conduct which you have so conspicuously exerted, amidst the tempests of war and the turmoils of government. but we wish to see you adorned with the garlands of peace, diffusing the blessings of domestic tranquillity.

War, at best, is but a necessary evil, a cruel game of blood, in which even triumph is embittered with all the horrors that can shock humanity; but peace is the gentle calm, in which the virtues of benevolence are happily displayed; in which those arts which polish and benefit mankind will lift their heads, and flourish under your protection.

Fired by the enchanting prospect, even we, the lowliest votaries of science, presume to offer you this well-intended endeavour to collect and keep alive the scattered seeds of literary improvement; until the genial warmth

⁷ See *Ibid.*, p. 79, where there is a relevant error in the text of the letter to Home (written at Chelsea, December 27, 1762), where Smollett commented on the consulship. The text (p. 79, lines 7-8) reads, "But, this Pear was thought far above my Pretensions." According to my photostat of this letter from the R. B. Adam Collection, on deposit in the University of Rochester Library, the text reads, "But, this Plan was thought too [~~"too"~~] far above my Pretensions." I am indebted to Robert F. Metzdorf for this photostat.

⁸ See L. M. Knapp, "An Important Smollett Letter," *RMS*, xii (1936), 77.

of your patronage shall invigorate the bloom, and call them forth to a more perfect vegetation. . . .

The Authors of the British Magazine *

The above emphasis on an anticipated peace should be noted because Smollett's subsequent attacks on Pitt were made when and because Pitt promoted the oncoming continental war, a move which Smollett, for what seem to me valid reasons, intensely disliked.

Smollett's disapproval of Pitt's foreign policy about 1760 was also vigorously expressed in his *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, vols. 1-4, published 1760-1; and later in *The Briton*, the first number of which came out on May 29, 1762. It was also evident in his probable reviews in *The Critical Review*, 1761-2.

In his *Continuation*¹⁰ Smollett's criticism of Pitt was unmistakably and eloquently set forth. Along with liberal praise of Pitt's patriotism, Smollett pointed out that Pitt's policy in promoting the so-called German war was thoroughly inconsistent with his earlier policy of opposing Robert Walpole's attitude toward Hanover.¹¹ Smollett also repeatedly condemned the European conflict on economic and humanitarian grounds. In this connection he gave a synopsis and expressed high approval of a book entitled *Considerations on the Present German War* by Israel Mauduit.¹²

The above book was given very favorable treatment in *The Critical Review* for November, 1760, in a review probably by Smollett.¹³ Other evidences of a growing criticism of Pitt's foreign policy are found in *The Critical Review* from 1760-2. These Smol-

* Quoted from *The British Magazine or Monthly Repository for Gentlemen & Ladies*, London, I [1760], II.

¹⁰ See *The Continuation of the Complete History of England* (London, 1760 5), I, 424, II, 4, 6, 18, 196, 261, 306, 381 ff.; 426-427; IV, 116, 327 ff.

¹¹ See Arnold Whitridge, *Tobias Smollett*, published by the author, 1925, p 75.

¹² Mauduit's *Considerations* was extremely popular and influential. According to a note in *The London Evening-Post*, 19-21 February, 1761, it was translated into French by Maubert, and was four times printed in England. I have a fourth edition dated 1761.

¹³ See *The Critical Review*, x (November, 1760), 403-4. The diction and appraisal in this review are very similar to Smollett's praise of Mauduit in his *Continuation*, IV, 155 ff.

lett no doubt approved even if he was not personally responsible for them

Smollett's attacks on Pitt increased in frequency and sharpness in *The Briton* more than a year after Pitt's resignation and pension. In *The Briton*, No. 2 (June 5, 1762) "the immaculate P - -" is chided for "his voluntary and headstrong resignation." In *The Briton*, No. 7 (July 10, 1762), Smollett insisted, however, in answer to a recent attack in the *Gazetteer*,¹⁴ that he could not be fairly accused of stating "that Mr. P - - tt never did any service to the nation." In number 8 of *The Briton* (July 18, 1762), Smollett condemned Pitt for plunging England into the German war. Repeatedly in later issues Smollett pleaded eloquently for peace, and the end of economic and human waste. Although he satirized Pitt very sharply in *The Briton*, No. 11 (August 7, 1762), under the name of Luca Pitti, he later admitted in No. 24 (November 6, 1762), that Pitt in his ministry removed governmental corruption. Finally in *The Briton*, No. 35 (January 22, 1763), Smollett, in contrasting the Earl of Bute with Pitt, asks whether Bute (like Pitt) ever glories "in an open contempt of all literary merit," cloaking "his disregard to writers, with the pretense of his disliking their flattery." This last statement may reflect, as Professor Whitridge suggested,¹⁵ some slight which Smollett had suffered from Pitt. On the whole, though, Smollett's attacks down to 1763 appear to be based on impersonal and economic beliefs, as an historian, indeed, Smollett made every effort to be impartial to the great commoner.

With these facts in mind, the reader is in a position to appraise the justice and sincerity of Smollett's appeal to the public in the following communication on the front page of *The Gazetteer and London Daily Advertiser* for Thursday, October 7, 1762.

To the Printer

Sir,

By a letter which I just now received from a friend at London, I am informed that I have been lately attacked in the *Ledger*,¹⁶ by some

¹⁴ I have not read this attack on Smollett.

¹⁵ See Whitridge, *op cit*, p. 75.

¹⁶ I have not yet found a file of *The Public Ledger* for September and October, 1762. This anonymous attack is referred to in *The True Flower of Brimstone: Extracted From The Briton, North Briton, and Auditor: And*

anonymous defamer, who, upon the supposition that I am author of a political paper called *the Briton*, taxes me with venality and inconsistency, for having in that paper, insulted Mr Pitt, whom I had before deified in the dedication of my history of England

I shall not give this unknown aggressor the satisfaction to declare that I have no connection with *the Briton* or any other paper whatsoever, written either for, or against the ministry but I challenge him and all the world to prove me guilty, in one single instance, of venality, prostitution, or any other species of dishonour

If it be imputed to me as a crime that I have blamed some parts of Mr. P—'s ministerial conduct, I plead guilty to the charge

I inscribed the first part of my history to that gentleman as the most distinguished patriot of the day, who excelled all his contemporaries in the powers of elocution, and exerted those powers in the service of his country, in stigmatizing a weak and corrupt administration, and particularly in exposing and opposing the absurdity and pernicious tendency of those German connections, which that administration had formed.

Though Mr P— as a M—r, afterwards adapted [*sic*] those very principles against which he had so long and so strenuously declaimed, I was surely under no obligation to follow his example, to renounce the maxims which I had always avowed, and violate my conscience out of respect to his character I thought it my duty to sacrifice every personal consideration to historical truth,¹⁷ and therefore, in the course of my continuation, I freely censured some particulars of his conduct

This being the true state of the case, I appeal to every man of sentiment and candour, whether the charge of apostacy, or inconsistency lies at my door, and whether the person, who has stabbed at my reputation in the public papers, is not actuated by the spirit of an illiberal assassin.

I am, Sir,
your humble servant.

T. Smollett .

Bath,
October 3, 1762.

humbly presented to the Noses of the Dukes of Cumberland, Devonshire, Newcastle and Bedford, The Earls Temple, Talbot and his Horse, Butc --- William Beckford, William Pitt, and John Wilkes, Esqrs. --- Printed for J. Williams, next the Mitre Tavern, Fleetstreet, 1763. On page 44 Smollett's reply is quoted in small part The editor of The True Flower in his advertisement commented on The Briton and The Auditor as follows: "The reader is desired to observe, that as the Briton and Auditor were never deemed worthy of being printed in volumes, not even with the assistance of PUBLIC MONEY, the references could be no otherwise intelligibly made than to their respective dates."

¹⁷ For another excellent illustration of Smollett's convictions about the importance of historical truth, see his letter to William Huggins, edited by L. F. Powell in *MP*, xxxiv (November, 1936), pp. 185-6.

The above letter is a vigorous defense of an attitude toward Pitt which appears to me to be quite justifiable. But it was not allowed to go unanswered. A few days later, one G. Nettleton published in the same newspaper a smartly ironical retort, which must have been quite acceptable to Smollett's numerous enemies, although some of them may have noted after they laughed over it that it carefully avoided the real issue about Pitt. It ran as follows:

To the Printer
Sir,

October 8

I was a good deal surprized at seeing a letter in your paper of yesterday, dated from Bath, October 3; and tho' the publick are too well acquainted with the modesty of the writer and his particular attachment to historical truth to need any illustration of them, yet, as that letter contains a challenge to all the world, every one in it is at liberty to bring to their remembrance a certain trial in Westminster-hall, and the fine and imprisonment consequent upon it, for a "Species of Dishonour." Every one is at liberty too to observe—whether it will be with most mirth or indignation I don't know—that the "Person who stabs at the reputation of others" every month in the C. R. has no reason to complain, that his adversary is actuated by the spirit of an illiberal assassin.

I am, Sir,

Your most humble servant

G. Nettleton¹⁸

Nettleton's attack surely expressed a feeling shared by many conservative readers that Smollett was under permanent disgrace as the result of his libel. It also voiced the keen dislike of many for the anonymous reviewing of that period.

Smollett's later attacks need only be glanced at here. In *The History and Adventures of an Atom*, Pitt's political career down to 1765 received extensive and severely satirical treatment. Therein his unscrupulous oratorical prowess and his political opportunism were angrily satirized in Smollett's general execration of political leaders of both parties. Again in *Humphry Clinker* we find what was probably Smollett's final attack on Pitt,¹⁹ where the latter is characterized as "the grand pensionary, that weather-cock of

¹⁸ I am unable to identify G. Nettleton. His reply appeared on Tuesday, October 12, 1762.

¹⁹ As the dates of composition of *The Atom* and of *Humphry Clinker* are not wholly clear, the exact chronology of Smollett's final respects to Pitt is still uncertain.

patriotism that veers about in every point of the political compass, and still feels the wind of popularity in his tail. He too, like a portentous comet, has risen again above the court-horizon;²⁰ but how long he will continue to ascend, it is not easy to foretell, considering his great eccentricity."²¹

This survey of Smollett's references to Pitt reveals a generally consistent attitude, an attitude not determined, I conclude, to any real extent by petty personal animosity. Smollett admitted Pitt's integrity and his great services to England before the German war. His adverse criticism should be taken as proof of his fairness and independence as a critic of a great but by no means infallible political leader.

LEWIS M. KNAPP

Colorado College,
Colorado Springs

A NOTE ON ROBERT HENRYSON'S ALLUSIONS TO RELIGION AND LAW

The materials for a biography of the Scottish Chaucerian, Robert Henryson (c. 1425-c. 1500), are virtually negligible,¹ yet in the course of composing his *Fables*, the Scot found occasion to make many topical allusions which afford one of the few approaches to a knowledge of his character and personality.² The purpose of this note is to present the poet's allusions to religion and law, to examine these allusions in the light of contemporary fact, and to clear the way toward a better understanding of Henryson's attitude on these subjects.

It has been conjectured that Henryson was a schoolmaster at the Grammar School within the famous Benedictine Abbey at

²⁰ Smollett is writing of Pitt's status in 1765-6.

²¹ From *Humphry Clinker*, Letter of J. Melford, London, June 2.

¹ Cf. G. G. Smith, *The Poems of Robert Henryson* (Edinburgh, 1906-1914), I, xix, H. H. Wood, *The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson* (Edinburgh, 1933), pp. xi ff. Quotations of Henryson's works are taken from Wood's edition.

² Cf. the writer's "Henryson and the Political Scene," *Studies in Philology* (July, 1943), XI, 380-389; "Robert Henryson and the Socio-Economic Scene," *ELH* x, 285-293.

Dunfermline.³ Although this school was located within the precincts of the abbey and was under the jurisdiction of the abbots, Henryson need not have been a monk.⁴ The supposition that the poet was not a churchman is given weight by the fact that he is nowhere designated by the ecclesiastical title "clericus" or "presbyter," and by the fact that his allusions to religious matters are highly critical.

The church reached its greatest material development in Scotland at the close of the thirteenth century. By the fifteenth century, because of the intervention of the crown and the short-sighted ecclesiastical policy of sanctioning that intervention, the church was well on the road which was to end in the Reformation of 1560. The rapid deterioration of the morals of both the clergy and the government of the church began in the reign of James III,⁵ and what is generally considered the turning point in Scottish church history took place at the abbey where Henryson presumably lived: in 1472, James III broke all precedent by appointing Henry Creichton to the position of Abbot of Dunfermline, over the heads of the monks who had duly elected Alexander Thomson, the pope confirmed the appointment with a papal bull.⁶

In his *Orpheus and Eurydice*, Henryson describes the wanderings of Orpheus in hell (ll 338-344):

Thair saw he mony pair and cardynall,
In haly kirk quhilk did abusoun,
and bischopis in thair pontificall,
Be symonie and wrang Intrusioun;
abbottis and all men of religioun,
ffor evill disponyng of thair place and rent,
In flame of fyre wer bitterly torment

³ Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, I, xxxiiff. Known today (if at all) as the birth-place of Andrew Carnegie, Dunfermline was important in Henryson's day as a Royal Burgh, as the site of the abbey, and as the residence and burial place of the Scottish kings, including Robert the Bruce. Perhaps the best-known reference to it in literature occurs in the opening lines of *Sir Patrick Spens*. Sir Walter Scott knew the burgh, for in 1822, after applying to the heritors, he procured the old abbey pulpit. Cf. J. C. R. Buckner, *Clark's Guide to Dunfermline* (Dunfermline, 1890), p. 19.

⁴ Cf. G. Chalmers, *Robene and Makyne* (Edinburgh, 1824), p. vii, note 2.

⁵ Cf. P. H. Brown, *History of Scotland* (Cambridge, 1900-1909), I, 263.

⁶ Comments on the significance of this event are summarized by I. F. Grant, *The Social and Economic Development of Scotland before 1603*

Although the poet is ostensibly relating an old story, it may well have taken courage not only to name such serious crimes in this Dantesque list of high-churchmen,⁷ but also to specify "abbottis" and the crime of "wrang Intrusioun"—an accurate description of the method by which James III established his own appointee at Dunfermline. There is no doubt that such abuses existed in Henryson's day,⁸ but to comment unfavorably upon them was a serious matter.⁹

In his fable, *The Fox and the Wolf*, Henryson illustrates the abuses to which the act of confession may be put. The Fox, believing that his time has come, seeks out Friar Wolf "Waitskaith" (one-who-waits-to-do-injury) who is described as follows (ll. 666-669) :

Ane worthie Doctour in Divinitie,
Freir Wolff Waitskaith, in science wonder sle,
To preich and pray wes new cummit fra the Closter
With Beidis in hand, sayand his pater noster.

The Fox's Address to his "Gostlie ffather under God" is double-edged satire (ll. 677-683) :

'Ye ar Mirroure, Lanterne, and sicker way.
Suld gyde sic sempill folk as me to grace,
Your bair fet, and your Russet Coull off gray,
Your lene cheik, your pail pietious face,
Schawis to me your perfite halines.
For weill wer him, that anis in his lyve
Had hap to yow his sinnis ffor to schryve'

The Wolf's bare feet and gray cowl would indeed have been considered unpretentious in Henryson's day.¹⁰ After the Fox has confessed the sins of theft and robbery, the Wolf proceeds with the three

(Edinburgh, 1930), pp. 220-221. Cf. further E. Henderson, *Annals of Dunfermline* (Glasgow, 1879), pp. 162-163

⁷ Cf. *Inferno*, xix. Concerning the seriousness of the sin of simony, cf. W. Murison, *Sir David Lyndsay* (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 102-105, 157. Cf. further A. I. Cameron, *The Apostolic Camera and Scottish Benefices* (London, 1934), pp. xxxi *et passim*.

⁸ Cf. G. G. Coulton, *Scottish Abbeys and Social Life* (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 253 ff., J. Dowden, *The Medieval Church in Scotland* (Glasgow, 1910), p. 127; Murison, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

⁹ Writing over a century later, when criticism of the church had become much more prevalent, Lyndsay still hesitates to bring charges against the clergy. Cf. Murison, *op. cit.*, p. 58

¹⁰ Cf. Dowden, *op. cit.*, p. 248 Cf. further Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

questions included in the Catholic sacrament of penance *contritio*, *confessio*, and *satisfactio* (ll. 698-699) ¹¹

'Art thou contrite, and sorie in thy Spreit
For thy trespas?'

The Fox replies that he is not contrite, and the Wolf continues (ll. 705-706) ¹²

'Sen thou can not forthink thy wickitnes,
Will thou forbear in tyme to cum and mend?

The Fox refuses, but the Wolf continues undisturbed (ll. 712-715):

'Weill' (quod the Wolff) 'thow wantis pointis twa,
Belangand to perfyte Confessioun
To the thrid part off penitence let us ga
Will thou tak pane for thy transgressioun?'

The Fox finally agrees to a little penance, "swa it wer licht, Schort, and not grevand to my tendernes," and is granted full remission. He is to eat no meat until Easter, but twice a week he may taste "puddingis" (forced meat), blood, and the heads, feet, and paunches (of fowl or sheep) ¹³

It is difficult to determine how dangerous a course Henryson was following, but it is certain that since the Scottish Reformation, in contrast to that of England, was considerably delayed, the poet was running counter to the explicit attitude of both church and state and incurring a greater risk than may at first be realized ¹⁴. An earlier or more effective illustration of the abuses to which the act of confession may be put has not been found in Scottish literature. ¹⁵

There is evidence which indicates that Henryson became a fellow of the University of Glasgow for the purpose of reading lectures in

¹¹ Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 13-14. The general practice regarding penance is summarized by Dowden, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

¹² The poet does not report the *confessio*, saying that it would not be suitable to do so. Cf. ll. 694-696.

¹³ Cf. ll. 726-729. The poet satirizes the friars elsewhere. Cf. ll. 2971-2972.

¹⁴ Cf. Grant, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-227.

¹⁵ The *Complaint of Scotland* and the poems of Dunbar and Lyndsay (cf. *Kittens Confessioun*), which contain criticism of the church, came long after the poet's day.

law.¹⁶ That the poet had a detailed knowledge of the law is certain. The subject was not simple, for in Henryson's day Scotland, unlike England, had no body of common law to guide its decisions, and there were continual but ineffective attempts to make a digest of the laws in order to remedy the confusion.¹⁷ Two systems of courts existed side by side in open competition: the civil and the ecclesiastical. The civil courts consisted primarily of the itinerant Justice-Ayres which sat at the Assizes and which were presided over by sheriffs.¹⁸ In Henryson's day, these sheriffs were powerful men who lived in royal castles, administered the crown estates, collected fines, and tried cases.¹⁹ The ecclesiastical courts, however, were better established and organized; they monopolized a large percentage of civil cases as well as the usual consistorial business; their judges were reputed to be the most learned men in the land;²⁰ and although they were notorious for their venality, they were extending their powers rapidly.²¹

In his fable, *The Sheep and the Dog*, Henryson criticizes both the civil and the ecclesiastical courts severely. The fable proper tells the story of the Dog who hails the Sheep into the church court to recover a piece of bread. The judge, a fraudulent Wolf who has "Authoritie and Jurisdiction," issues a "Citatioun" (ll. 1155-1159):

I, Maister Wolff, partles off fraud and gyle,
Under the panis off hie Suspensioun,
Off grit Cursing, and Interdictioun,
Schir Scheip, I charge the for to compeir,
And answer to ane Doig befor me heir

The ecclesiastical penalties, *suspensio totalis*, *excommunicatio major*, and *interdictio*, were the customary weapons of the church

¹⁶ Cf. D. Laing, *The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson* (Edinburgh, 1865), p. xii.

¹⁷ Cf. J. Taylor, *The Pictorial History of Scotland* (London, 1859), I, 367 ff.

¹⁸ The burgh courts, which nominally dealt with all cases arising within the burghs except the four pleas of the crown, were less important. Cf. Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

¹⁹ Cf. Grant, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-31.

²⁰ Cf. C. Innes, *Sketches of Early Scotch History and Social Progress* (Edinburgh, 1861), p. 263.

²¹ Cf. Murison, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-110; Coulton, *op. cit.*, p. 84. Cf. further Dowden, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-307.

courts.²² The frequent use of these penalties, even to enforce payment of small debts, made them increasingly ineffective.²³

A Raven is made "Apparitour," an officer of the church court, and he serves the summons and endorses the writ. The trial starts at sundown, with the Fox as clerk and notary, and the Kite and Vulture as advocates at the bar. The Sheep, although abject with fear, reveals a knowledge of the law, for he queries the jurisdiction of the court, declining the judge, the time, and the place (l. 1187). Since the trial is being held at night, an unlawful hour, the Sheep is technically correct.²⁴

Temporarily foiled, the Wolf bids the parties choose two arbiters according to law, and the Bear and the Badger are chosen (ll. 1212-1222).

And thairupon, as Jugis, thay sat doun,
And held ane lang quhyle disputatioun,
Seikand full mony Decretis off the Law,
And Glosis als, the veritie to knaw

Of Civile Law volumnis full mony thay revolve,
The Codies and Digestis new and ald,
Contrait, Prostrait Argumentis thay resolve,
Sum objecting, and sum can hald;
For prayer, or price, trow ye that thay wald fald?
Bot hald the glose, and Text of the Decreis,
As trew Jugis; I beschrew thame ay that leis

This satire on the various authorities consulted by the two arbiters reflects the state of confusion in which the law existed in the poet's day. The reference to the "Codies and Digestis" may be an allusion to the ridiculous division of the Pandects by Bulgarius in the twelfth century.²⁵

The two arbiters decide that the court has jurisdiction, and Henryson states correctly that the Sheep has no appeal from a decision by arbiters of his own choosing.²⁶ Thus the trial concludes (ll. 1245-1247):

The Wolff chargit the Scheip, without delay,
Under the panis off Interdictioun,
The soume off silver, or the bread, to pay.

²² Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 20-21.

²³ Cf. Coulton, *op. cit.*, p. 59; Murison, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

²⁴ Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 20-21.

²⁵ Cf. Lord Hailes, *Ancient Scottish Poems* (Edinburgh, 1770), p. 329.

²⁶ Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 22.

The Sheep is left naked and bare in the field.

In this fable, Henryson shows his detailed knowledge of the law by emphasizing the absurdities in the *form of process* of the church courts; in the *moralitas* to the same fable, the poet turns his attention to the civil courts.²⁷ The Sheep becomes the poor commons and the Wolf a sheriff (ll. 1265-1268)

This Wolf I likkin to ane Schref stout,
 Quhilk byis ane forfalt at the Kingis hand,
 And hes with him ane cursit Assyis about,
 And dytis all the pure men up on land.

This sheriff, who buys fines from the king and indicts poor men, is the judge of the civil courts who presides over the Assizes of the itinerant Justice-Ayres. Henryson had valid grounds for criticism, for the Justice-Ayres were notoriously corrupt and there are frequent references in the statute books to judges who neglect to uphold the laws.²⁸

The Raven is likened to a coroner (ll. 1272-1278):

This Ravin I likkin to ane fals Crownair,
 Quhilk hes ane portioun of the Indritement,
 And passis furth befor the Justice Air,
 All misdoairs to bring to Jugement;
 Bot luke, gif he wes of ane trew Intent,
 To scrapi out Johnie, and wryte in Will, or Wat,
 And tak ane bud at both the parteis tat.

The coroner is an officer of the civil court, and his "portioun," which he alters for bribes, is the list of offenders furnished by the local authorities.²⁹

In the sheep's lament, affixed to the end of the fable, Henryson expresses the strongest sympathy with the poor man who suffers injustice at the hands of the courts.³⁰ With the emphatic directness of an old Scots preacher, the sheep cries (ll. 1295-1298):

²⁷ Cf. Hailes, *op. cit.*, p. 328. Lord Hailes inferred that, since the satire of the fable is aimed at the church and the application at the civil, Henryson "stood more in awe of the court spiritual than of the temporal." *Ibid.*, p. 329. This conclusion seems unnecessary. The action would have obtained in either court, and the poet may be taking the opportunity to criticize both.

²⁸ Cf. Taylor, *op. cit.*, I, 367.

²⁹ Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 22

³⁰ The poet castigates the man-of-law elsewhere (ll. 2721-2727).

Lord God, quhy sleipis thow sa lang?
 Walk, and discernie my cause, groundit on richt;
 Se how I am, be fraud, maistrie, and slicht
 Peillit full bair

And Henryson drives the point home (ll 1300-1320)

Se how this cursit sone of covetice,
 Loist hes baith lawtie and eik Law
 Now few or nane will execute Justice,
 In falt of quhome the pure man is overthrow
 The veritie, suppois the Juge it knaw,
 He is so blindit with affectioun,
 But dreid, for micht, he lettis the richt go down
 Seis thow not (Lord) this warld overturnit is,
 As quha wald change gude gold in leid or tyn,
 The pure is peillit, the Lord may do na mis,
 And Simonie is haldin for na syn
 Now is he blyith with okker maist may wyn,
 Gentrice is slane, and pietie is ago,
 Allace (gude Lord) quhy thowis thow it so?
 Thow thowis this evin for our grit offence,
 Thow sendis us troubill, and plagis soir,
 As hunger, derth, grit weir, or Pestilence,
 Bot few amendis now thair lyfe thairfour.
 We pure pepill as now may de no moir
 Bot pray to the, sen that we ar opprest
 In to this erth, grant us in hevin gude rest.

The force and flavor of this plea for justice, in which the poet links himself with the poor, is unexcelled in Scottish literature.

Henryson appears to have been a poet who not only had an excellent knowledge of and a highly critical attitude toward the law but who also was an uncompromising and courageous critic of the legal and religious abuses of his day. His attitude toward these subjects reveals a skeptical intelligence with a hatred of injustice and love for his fellow man.

MARSHALL W. STEARNS

Indiana University

ROBERT HENRYSON AND THE LEPER CRESSEID

The Scottish Chaucerian, Robert Henryson (c 1425-c.1500), in his *Testament of Cresseid*, a sequel to Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, added an element to the Troilus legend which bids fair to be permanent: the leprosy of Cresseid. The implication of Professor Rollins' statement that the poet, in so doing, "forever damned her as a loose woman"¹ may be misleading, for Henryson was returning, in part, to the traditional characterization of his heroine.² On the other hand, in reversing the fates of Troilus and Criseyde, Henryson broke the chains of medieval authority which bound Chaucer. The credit for conceiving of the punishment of leprosy is entirely Henryson's, and the general adoption of this detail by later authors, including Shakespere and Dryden, testifies to its poetic justice. The present note is an attempt to examine the poet's background for and presentation of the leprosy of Cresseid.

Leprosy was common in Scotland long before and after Henryson's day. The first leper-house north of the Tweed was founded in 1177, and Robert the Bruce died of the disease in 1329, unlike England, where leprosy reached its peak about the twelfth century and had nearly died out by the fifteenth,³ Scotland was crowded with lepers until a relatively late date, the disease lingering on in the northern part of the country until the end of the eighteenth century.⁴

In 1427, the Scottish parliament decreed that lepers could enter the burghs three times a week only, and not at all if a fair or

¹ H. E. Rollins, "The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespere," *PMLA* (1917), xxxiii, 397.

² Criseyde is liberally damned both before and after Chaucer. See J. S. P. Tatlock, "The People in Chaucer's Troilus," *PMLA* (1941), lvi, 101, note 63. Benoît, Guido, and Boccaccio condemn her fiercely for her infidelity. It is rather in Chaucer and Henryson that the exception occurs. Cf. further W. W. Lawrence, "The Love Story in 'Troilus and Cressida,'" *Shakespearean Studies* (New York, 1916), pp. 204-205.

³ See R. M. Clay, *The Mediaeval Hospitals of England* (London, 1909), pp. 37 ff.

⁴ See P. H. Brown, *Scotland before 1700 from Contemporary Documents* (Edinburgh, 1893), pp. 199-200.

market was being held, lepers were also forbidden to beg in kirk or kirkyard, or any other place in town, and ordered to stay outside the burghs and beg either at their own hospitals or at the town gate.⁵ In the light of these decrees, we can see why Henryson set the vivid scene of the lepers, in the *Testament of Cresseid*, swarming around the returning troops of Troilus, shaking their cups, and begging for alms (ll 484 ff.),⁶ outside the walls of Troy. Leper hospitals were frequently located outside of the towns,⁷ and when the poet says that Calchas opened a secret gate and conveyed his daughter to a village half a mile away, leaving her at the spital-house (ll 388-391), Henryson may be employing details which he had observed in the town of Dunfermline.⁸

Besides being strictly segregated, the lepers were also sadly neglected. The Scottish leper-houses in particular were poorly or not at all endowed, and the lepers were forced to depend almost entirely upon begging. There are many references in the *Testament to Cresseid's* "cop," or begging bowl, and her "clapper," or wooden rattle.⁹ When Henryson says that there was nothing for Cresseid to do but to go forth with the lepers "fra place to place, quhill cauld and hounger sair compellit hir to be ane rank beggar" (ll. 482-483), he is describing the fate of lepers in his day. Further, it was customary to send spoiled pork or salmon to the lepers,¹⁰ and Cresseid's references to "mowlit breid, peirrie and ceder sour" (l. 441), as well as the poet's description of the "uncouth fair and harbery" (l. 403) of the leper-house lend realistic force to Cresseid's plea, "sum merit for chertie me send to leif upon" (ll 383-384). The poet adds that Calchas "daylie sent hir part of his almous" (l. 392).

Henryson's description of Cresseid's symptoms is remarkably detailed. Saturn announces (ll. 316-318):

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

⁶ All references to lines in the *Testament of Cresseid* are taken from the edition of H. H. Wood (Edinburgh, 1933).

⁷ Clay, *op. cit.*, pp. xix ff.

⁸ The gate may refer to a historic gate in the south wall of the monastery on Priory Lane, the village to the outlying settlement known then (and today) as Nethertown, and the spital-house to St. Leonard's hospital. See E. Henderson, *The Annals of Dunfermline* (Glasgow, 1879), pp. 169-170.

⁹ Cf. ll 343, 387, 442, 492, 579. Cf. Clay, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69.

¹⁰ G. G. Coulton, *Medieval Panorama* (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 455-456

'I change thy mirth into Melancholy,
 Quhilk is the Mother of all pensivenes,
 Thy Moisture and thy heit in cald and dry '

To this, Cynthia adds (ll 334-343):

'Fra heit of bodie I the now depyrye,
 And to thy seiknes sal be na recure,
 Bot in dolour thy dayis to Indure
 Thy Cristall Ene minglit with blude I mak,
 Thy voice sa cleir, unplesand hoir and hace,
 Thy lustis lyre ourspreid with spottis blak,
 And lumpis haw appeirand in thy face
 Quhair thou cumis, Ilk man sal fle the place
 This sall thou go begging fra hous to hous
 With Cop and Clapper lyke ane Lazarous'

Later, Cresseid says in her "Complaint" (ll. 438-451):

'This Lipper Ludge tak for thy burelie Bour
 And for thy Bed tak now ane bunche of stro,
 For wailit Wyne, and Meritis thou had tho,
 Tak mowlit Breid, Peirrie and Ceder sour
 Bot Cop and Clapper, now is all ago
 My cleir voice, and courthe carrolling,
 Quhair I was wont with Ladyis for to sing,
 Is rawk as Ruik, full hiddeous hoir and hace,
 My plesand port all utheris precelling.
 Of lustines I was hald maist condng
 Now is deformit the Figour of my face,
 To lunk on it, na Leid now lyking hes
 Sowpit in syte, I say with sair sicking,
 Ludgerit amang the Lipper Leid allace'

This description of the symptoms of leprosy is so accurate that the doctor, Sir J. Y. Simpson, cited it as proof that cases of Greek elephantiasis existed in Scotland just as they are known to have existed on the continent. Dr. Simpson says:¹¹

The particular symptoms which he [Henryson] makes Saturn invoke upon Cresseid, to transform her into a Leper, are exactly the most marked symptoms of Greek elephantiasis . . . In this remarkable passage, those more striking symptoms, the swellings, lumps, or livid tubercles on the face, the morbid alteration of the voice and skin, and that turgid and injected

¹¹ J. Y. Simpson, "Antiquarian Notices of Leprosy and Leper Hospitals in Scotland and England," *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal*, LVI, 139-140.

appearance of the eye, which Dr Good has given as one of his characteristic symptoms of the *genus* Elephantiasis, are all tersely, yet accurately described

In passages subsequent to that which I have quoted (ll 337-343), Henryson reiterates some of the more prominent symptoms. Thus, the hopeless Cresseid describes what is elsewhere termed "hir uglye Lipper face, The quhilk befor was quhyte as Lillie flour," as "deformit the Figour," and again also she describes and laments the characteristic morbid change in the voice.

In Henryson's day, leprosy was classified according to four types: leonina, elephantiasis, alopecia, and tyria, and of these four types, elephantiasis was regarded (and is still regarded) as practically incurable.¹² The poet indicates several times in the *Testament* that there was "na recure" for Cresseid.¹³ Further, since the duty of inspecting and reporting lepers often devolved upon the parish priest, who frequently became something of an expert on the subject,¹⁴ there may be some connection between this fact and Henryson's statement that Calchas, who was a priest, looked upon his daughter's face and "knew weil that their was na succour to hir seiknes" (ll 376-377). Again, Cresseid's desire not to be known and her request to be taken secretly to the leper-house (ll 380-382) is in keeping with a frequently-noted symptom of leprosy: the desire to avoid society.¹⁵

Henryson's presentation of Cresseid's leprosy also shows a knowledge of astrology and astrological medicine. The poet was following the example of Chaucer, whose "originality in employing astrology for poetic purposes is incontestable, and is, perhaps, unrivaled in the entire realm of mediaeval literature."¹⁶ For, in the *Testament*, the choice of the planets, Saturn and Cynthia, to judge Cresseid is not accidental. Whereas the complexion of Cresseid's avowed goddess, Venus, is hot and moist, and Cresseid is described in the *Testament* as having a sanguine temperament composed of these two qualities,¹⁷ the complexion of Saturn is cold and dry, or melan-

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 313

¹³ Cf. the *Testament*, ll. 335, 376, 411, and 455.

¹⁴ See R. M. Clay, *The Medieval Hospitals of England* (London, 1909), p. 59.

¹⁵ Cf. *John of Gaddesden and the Rosa Medicinæ*, ed. H. P. Cholmeley (Oxford, 1912), p. 45.

¹⁶ T. O. Wedel, *The Mediaeval Attitude toward Astrology* (New Haven, 1920), pp. 143-144.

¹⁷ Cf. ll. 318, 334.

cholic, the qualities conferred upon Cresseid by the verdict of the planets¹⁸ Again, one of the diseases under the jurisdiction of Saturn is leprosy,¹⁹ while melancholy, Cresseid's newly-conferred complexion, was commonly supposed to be the cause of elephantiasis, the specific type of leprosy which Henryson describes.²⁰ Further, Cresseid is afflicted with this disease between noon and supper-time, during the third set of hours when melancholy rules.²¹

All in all, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Henryson had not only observed lepers at first hand, but also was sufficiently acquainted with astrology and the medical theory of his times to select the most formidable type of leprosy, thus making Cresseid's fate irrevocable, as well as to present his heroine's disease in terms of the astrological lore which the Middle Ages generally credited.

MARSHALL W. STEARNS

Indiana University

CANON'S YEOMAN'S PROLOGUE, G., LL. 563-566: HORSE
OR MAN

The problem in the lines indicated from CYP above involves text and interpretation. To place them in their setting, I quote the entire related passage (554-568) from Manly and Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1940), iv, 308:

When ended was the lyf of sainte Cecile	
Er we hadde riden fully fyue mile	555
At Boghtoun vnder Blee ve gan atake	
A man that clothed was in clothes blake	
And vnder that he hadde a whit surplys	
His hakeney that was al pomely grys	
So swatte that it wonder was to see	560
It semed he hadde priked myles three	
The hors eek that his yemen rood vp on	

¹⁸ Cf. ll. 316, 318

¹⁹ Cf. W. Lilly, *Christian Astrology* (London, 1647), p. 59.

²⁰ A typical exposition of this fact occurs in Bartholomaeus Anglicus' *De Proprietatibus Rerum* (tr. Trevisa), Bk. VII, chap. lxx, where the author states that the type of leprosy known as elephantiasis "cometh of pure melancolia," and is "worse to heale than other." Cf. further W. C. Curry, *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences* (New York, 1926), pp. 41 ff.

²¹ See Curry, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

So swatte that vnnethe myghte he gon
 Aboute the peitrel stood the foom ful hye
 He was of foom al flekked as a pye
 A male twevfolde on his croper lay
 It semed that he caried lite array
 All light for somer rood this worthy man

565

Skeat (Oxford, 1900), Robinson (Boston, 1933), and Manly, *Canterbury Tales* (New York, 1928) in l. 563 read *it* instead of the *he* of the critical text just quoted. Skeat comments "The horse is denoted by *it* (l. 563), the word *hors* being neuter in the Oldest English. Most MSS read *he* for *it* in l. 563, but there is nothing gained by it" (*op cit.*, v. 417). Ll. 564-65 are not in the Ellesmere MS. Consequently, Manly, who followed this MS in his textbook edition referred to above, omits them.

With this explanation, I turn to interpret ll. 563-567 in the critical text. They are imbedded in the midst of one of the finest passages by Chaucer, a description of healthy animal sweat on horses and men under exertion on a hot spring morning. Chaucer's delight in the whole passage finds expression in the climax, when he tells how the perspiration ran down the forehead of the canon despite the burdock-leaf put under his hood to keep him cool—"But it was joye for to seen hym swete!"

The problem of interpretation arises from the pronouns employed as Manly and Rickert in the critical text decide Chaucer intended them. In this description we have two men and two horses. The canon, dressed in a black overgarment, was riding a dappled gray horse that sweated so "that it wonder was to see." The yeoman is identified only as the rider of a horse that was nearly exhausted from sweating: "So swatte that unnethe myghte he gon." Then we come to the lines omitted from Ellesmere, Fitzwilliam, and Add. 35286 MSS. but included in the critical text, in Skeat, and Robinson (564-565). Skeat gives the following interpretation, accepted by Robinson: "The word *He* (like *his* in l. 566) refers to the Canon, whose clothing was *black*. As the critical text stands, and even as the lines read in Skeat and Robinson, ll. 562-566 form a unit describing the yeoman's horse. From galloping for three miles "he" was in a lathery sweat which showed like foam above the strap (peitrel) across his chest—to hold the saddle firmly in place. Evidence that "He" (l. 565) in the critical text refers logically to the horse not the canon as looking like a magpie

from flecks of foam comes from the unbroken connection in l. 566, which describes the double traveling bag lying on his (the horse's) crupper. *NED* cites this passage under crupper as referring to "the hind-quarters or rump of a horse." Crupper is cited earliest in *NED* as referring to the buttocks of a man in 1594. (Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*). "A close bellied doublet comming down . . . as farre as the crupper." Furthermore, granting that this might refer to a man, how could either the canon or his yeoman be sitting in a saddle and have a bag lying on his crupper? This unit of description ending with "lay" should close with a period. We then return to the canon, whose bag on his servant's horse seemed to contain little, as would be fitting for travel in hot weather.

In all of this I am not concerned merely with laboring a point. I am interested first in what seems to me the correct interpretation of an unbroken unit within a vivid sensuous description, almost unrivaled for sweaty verisimilitude. Then I raise through it the question of Chaucer's finished art here. Concerning the text of the CY Prologue and Tale, the editors write: "The source of all MSS. seems to have been Chaucer's rough draft or a hasty fair copy of it" (*Text* iv, 307). Maybe Chaucer did finally intend to describe the foamy sweat from the chest of the dappled gray horse as flecking the black overgarment of the canon so that he looked like a magpie. But that is not what logical interpretation of the lines in the *critical text* indicates.

GEORGE R. COFFMAN

The University of North Carolina

ANOTHER ANALOGUE FOR THE VIOLATION OF THE MAIDEN IN THE "WIFE OF BATH'S TALE"

In one of a series of able articles, convincing in their totality, in which Dr. Laura Hibbard Loomis attempts to prove Chaucer's familiarity with the Auchinleck MS ["Chaucer and the Breton Lays of the Auchinleck MS," SP XXXVIII (1941), 14-33] she uses as a minor link in her chain of evidence the meeting of Sir Degaré (Auchinleck MS) with a princess alone in the woods as a possible source for the similar scene in the opening of the "Wife of Bath's Tale." Even if this incident from *Sir Degaré* appears

to be only an analogue, it has some significant points of similarity, as Mrs. Loomis cogently observes. Because of my interest in "The Wife of Bath's Tale" as a whole in another connection, I have noted several other analogues, some generously called to my attention by Professors Craig and Loomis. A goodly number are accessible in G. H. Maynard's *The Wife of Bath's Tale. Its Sources and Analogues* (1901) or through references in Stith Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* (1932 ff.) The purpose of this note is only to call attention to a new analogue which has certain striking similarities, and also possible implications for students of Celtic literature, who are in a better position than I to determine this point.

For this analogue I am indebted to Dr. Irene P. McKeehan through an illuminating article, "The Book of the Nativity of St. Cuthbert" [PMLA, XLVIII (1933), 981-999]; intended to illustrate "the close relations existing at times between two great types of medieval fiction, the romance and the saint's legend." The analogue concerns the enforced conception of St. Cuthbert. Prefatory to giving this I summarize from Dr. McKeehan certain facts for the background. She cites two documents. One is the *Libellus de Nativitate Sancti Cuthberti de Historiis Hybernensium* [*Miscellanea Biographica, Surtees Soc. Pub.*, VIII (1838), 63 ff.], "belonging to the Dean and Chapter of York," and of the early fourteenth century. Another manuscript of this same document is in the British Museum, Titus A II (see *Misc. Biog., op. cit.*, Preface, ix, xi). The other is the *Northern Metrical Life of St. Cuthbert*, whose "acknowledged source of the first part" is the *Libellus* [Surtees Soc. Pub. 87 (1891)]. This MS, of the middle of the fifteenth century, is in its first part a "reasonably close translation" of the *Libellus*. The date of the MSS in neither case has any "bearing on the age of the story." The possible implications for Celticists are epitomized in a passage on p. 983: "It is . . . interesting to note that at a time closely approximating to the flourishing period of Chrétien de Troyes in France and of 'Thomas,' the author of *Tristan*, in England, an English monk, presumably of Durham, had access to two sources of Irish story: (1) written documents, and (2) oral traditions."

Here is the essence of the situation, with the immediate background for our purposes. St. Cuthbert's maternal grandfather, king of Leinster, with all of his family except a daughter, was

slain by the king of Connacht. The king took her to his home, where his wife made a "slutte" of her and put her to "vile services." As she grew to beautiful womanhood the king fell in love with her. She repelled his advances. One spring day, according to the custom, she and her companions went to the woods to gather flowers for the queen's room. The king, returning from hawking "by a ryuer side," came upon her lost and alone and ravished her. The child born of this union became St. Cuthbert.

I follow now with the exact account as given by the author of the *Libellus* (*op. cit.*, 67):

Igitur apud Hybernenses tunc lex consuetudinis extitit, quod, certis aestivis temporibus, grex puellarum serviens silvarum saltus adire gregatim debuit; ibique frondium flores exciperet et competentibus onerata sarcinulis Reginae thalamis coronandis inferret opusque tale servitutis omnis puellarum familia Reginae persolvere debuit. Sin autem florum copia reperiri tunc temporis non quivisset, debilis familia juncti viridantis, vel herbae virentis, seu etiam flosculi cujusvis bene olentis, onera vel fasciculos congregaret. Cum, igitur, quodam tempore, consueta Reginae festiva sollempnitas accidisset, hanc cum sodalibus ad praescripti operis exercitia direxit Quae, alius festinantius cum sarcinulis regredientibus, sola derelinquitur, eo quod manum in falcem mittere minus docta probaretur. Quae, tamen, ex laborioso usu consuetudinis non didicit, compositam quandoque humeris sarcinulam exposuit, sicque per viarum invia comite destituta oberravit Contigitque, ut juxta ripas sola soli Regi occurreret, cum aves aquatiles avium naturali violentia sagacium arceret. Sed humiliter allocutam nec blanditis flectere nec munerum promissionibus potuit mentem captivare. Unde consultata tandem conscientia forciori dextera corrupuit (qu. corripuit) virginem, et secrecioribus silvis eductam, viribus utens, oppresit. Ista sane oppresio conceptionis Cuthberti celebratio fuerat.

For the convenience of the reader I quote the closing situation from the metrical version of the fifteenth century (*Northern Metrical Life*, *op. cit.*, 6):

It fell' þat by a ryuer side,
þe kyng on hawkyng went þat tyde,
he all' ane þe mayden mett,
he spake til hir luf to gett.
Pare myght na faire speche avayle,
She walde noȝt sent hir to assayle.
At þe last þe kyng hir braaste,
In to thik wode he haaste,
And þar agaynee þe virginne will'
Rauyset hir and his lust fulfill.

Last for comparative purposes is the passage from the "Tale":

And so bifel that this king Arthour
 Hadde in his hous a lusty bacheler,
 That on a day cam ridyng fro ryver,
 And happed that, allone as she was born,
 He saugh a mayde walkyng hym biforn,
 Of which mayde anon, maugree hir heed,
 By verray force, he rafte hire maydenhed,
 For which oppressioun was swich clamour

(D 882-89)

In some respects the situation and the phrasing of the analogue above are closer to those in this passage than in any other with which I am familiar. I add the last line for a particular reason. In the Latin passage above, in the last sentence the word for the violation is *oppressio*. Chaucer's employment of this exact word for this exact meaning is found only here and in LGW 1868, in connection with the rape of Lucrece (see NED, *Oppression*, 4. Forceful violation of a woman, rape.)

GEORGE R. COFFMAN

The University of North Carolina

VARIANT READINGS IN THREE OF SHELLEY'S POEMS

In the *TLS*. for August 29, 1939, I recorded my discovery of three poems by Shelley, "To Stella," "Methought I Was a Billow," and "On Keats," in *The Album Wreath of Music and Literature*, Vol. II, for 1834. This is an earlier publication date for the poems than has hitherto been given: 1839 (Mrs. Shelley's first edition of her husband's *Poetical Works*) for "To Stella" and "On Keats," and 1870 (Rossetti's edition of Shelley's poems) for the fragment, "Methought I Was a Billow."¹ In all three poems there are interesting variants from the accepted texts.

A transcript of these three poems in Mary Shelley's hand consisting of a single page headed "MS Fragments" was in the possession of Elkin Mathews and was sold by Hodgson in 1922 to W. T. Spencer, dealer in rare books.² It was still in Mr. Spencer's possession in 1936, but his successors have no record of its subsequent fortunes.

¹ See the Julian Edition of Shelley's *Works*, IV, 413, 424.

² See *Book Prices Current* for 1922, p. 784.

The apparent inaccessibility of this transcript is unfortunate, for a comparison of these texts of the three poems with those in *The Album Wreath* would be interesting. Since John Francis, editor of *The Album Wreath*, chose just these three poems for publication, it is probable that he had access either to this transcript or to one similar to it.³ It is therefore also probable that the readings in the *Album Wreath* texts which differ from those of the later editions would be found in this copy by Mary Shelley and might have a basis in some undiscovered manuscript of Shelley's. All the readings are possible and a few of them seem to me poetically superior to the familiar versions.

The lines "On Keats" read as follows:

On Keats

By P B Shelley

Original

Keats desired that on his tomb should be inscribed,—“Here
lieth one whose name was writ on water”

Here lieth one whose name was writ on water,

But ere the breath that could erase it, blew

Death, the immortalizing winter flew

Athwart the stream, and Time's mouthless torrent grew

A scroll of chrystal, blazoning the name

Of—Adonais!

There are here a number of differences from the later printed versions in arrangement, punctuation, and capitalization—differences which are not significant. The line, “Death, in remorse for that fell slaughter,” is omitted, probably merely by a printer's error. The obvious misplacing of the comma in the second line occurs also in the first issue of Mrs. Shelley's 1839 edition of the *Poetical Works*, but it was corrected in the second. In the succeeding line “winter” appears, obviously incorrectly, as “writer” in the first 1839 issue only.⁴ The following line, “Athwart the stream,

³ I have found, however, no proof of any connection between Francis and Mary Shelley or any of her circle. Apparently not the John Francis of the *Athenaeum*, he contributed to various periodicals and published two small volumes of very minor verse and prose, *Sunshine; or Lays for Ladies* and *Rainbow Sketches, in Prose and Verse*, the latter in 1835.

⁴ “Writer” is the reading also in the typed transcript of a letter from Mary to Trelawny (May 10, 1823), furnished by Sir John Shelley-Rolls and quoted by his permission. The MS itself is unfortunately inaccessible.

and Time's mouthless torrent grew," shows the awkward "and" which appears in both 1839 editions and in the Shelley-Rolls transcript but is omitted in later editions. Most interesting of the variants is the word "mouthless." This is the reading in Mary's letter to Trelawny as printed in Marshall,⁵ but "monthless" occurs in the Shelley-Rolls transcript, in the two 1839 editions,⁶ and in Rossetti's edition of 1870. "Monthless" makes little or no sense. It might easily be, however, a misreading of "mouthless." And "mouthless" suits the metaphor of Time's torrent, if one thinks of Time as having neither beginning nor end. The reading "printless," which occurs in modern editions, is probably better poetically. According to the Julian Edition of Shelley's works, it is taken from a Boscombe manuscript.⁷ But since "monthless" could hardly have been a mistake on the part of Mary Shelley or anyone else for "printless," whereas it could easily be an error for "mouthless," there seems to be strong evidence that there was another manuscript reading of the poem.

Of the fragment beginning, "Methought I was a billow," *The Album Wreath* printed only the first four lines. The only variation from the later printed versions is "on" for "in" in the first line: "Methought I was a billow on the crowd." Since one usually speaks of a billow *on* the ocean, not *in* the ocean, this reading seems to suit the metaphor better than the familiar one. It would be very easy to misread one preposition for the other in either Shelley's or Mary's hand. Sir John Shelley-Rolls and Mr. Ingpen, however, evidently had no doubt about the reading "in" of the Boscombe MS, for they make no correction in *Verse and Prose*.

The quatrain "To Stella" reads as follows in *The Album Wreath*:

In the letter as printed in Mrs Julian Marshall's *Life and Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley* (London, 1889, II, 76) the reading is "winter."

⁵ See note 4, above.

⁶ Locock, in his *Poems of Shelley* (London [1911]) gives "mouthless" as the reading of Mrs. Shelley's edition. It is "monthless," however, in all the copies which I have seen.

⁷ Vol IV, p. 413. It is not mentioned in the privately printed *Verse and Prose from the Manuscripts of Shelley*, edited by Shelley-Rolls and Ingpen (London, 1934).

Thou wert the morning star amongst the living,
 Ere thy new light had fled,
 Now, having died, thou art as Hesperus, giving
 New splendour to the dead.

In the first line, "amongst" is no improvement over the usual "among." But in the second line the adjective "new" instead of "fair," which appears in all later editions, seems to me poetically more effective. "Fair" is the obvious, commonplace epithet for light, a mere expletive in the line; "new" not only avoids triteness, it is significant of the morning star and also of the youth of Keats, to whom Shelley applied Plato's epigram.⁸ The second appearance of the adjective in the fourth line does not weaken, it intensifies the meaning, creating a kind of poetic tension in the slightly different uses of the same word: the new light of the morning star, having become the light of the evening star, still gives "new splendour." When Shelley "took up the pen and improvised," as Medwin said,⁹ he may have used "fair" to fill out the line. But I should like to think that there was a later manuscript showing "new" as the result of further thought and revision. The repetition in the original Greek of the verb (*δαμνῶς* . . . *λάμπας*) tends to support the repetition of the adjective in the paraphrase.

ELIZABETH NITCHIE

Goucher College

PERSONAL SOURCES FOR MAUPASSANT'S CONTES

The three travel books by Guy de Maupassant, *Au soleil* (1884), *La vie errante* (1890), and especially *Sur l'eau* (1884), contain autobiographical material and reflections which throw considerable light on their author's better known short-narrative works.

Some of this writing bristles with indignation at social evils, thus revealing a Maupassant quite different from the impersonal naturalistic artist that undiscerning critics love to paint.¹ For instance,

⁸ He placed it on the title page of *Adonais*. See also Thomas Medwin's account of the writing of the poem in his life of Shelley (ed. H. Buxton Forman, Oxford, 1913, pp. 349-50).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 349.

¹ For the question of Maupassant's subjectivism vs his impersonality, see Cox, Roy Alan: *Dominant Ideas in the Works of Guy de Maupassant*,

Sur l'eau contains an impassioned outcry against the institution of war, as a prime example of human stupidity, answering in a series of burning paragraphs Von Moltke's assertion that blood-letting prevents mankind from descending to the most hideous materialism.² Men are too much thoughtless, evil children to have weapons of war entrusted to them, Maupassant concludes. To establish this point, his own experiences during the Franco-Prussian War are quoted:

Nous l'avons vue, la guerre. Nous avons vu les hommes redevenus des brutes, affolés, tuer par plaisir, par terreur, par bravade, par ostentation. Alors que le droit n'existe plus, que la loi est morte, que toute notion du juste disparaît, nous avons vu fusiller des innocents trouvés sur une route et devenus suspects parce qu'ils avaient peur. Nous avons vu tuer des chiens enchaînés à la porte de leurs maîtres pour essayer des revolvers neufs, nous avons vu mitrailler par plaisir des vaches couchées dans un champ, sans aucune raison, pour tirer des coups de fusil, histoire de rire.³

These details from personal life doubtless constitute the basis for one of the introductory paragraphs in the author's bitterly sarcastic short story about the French home-front in war time, *Un coup d'état*. There he writes:

Le seul fait de tenir des armes, de manier des fusils à système affolait ces gens qui n'avaient jusqu'ici manie que des balances, et les rendait, sans aucune raison, redoutables au premier venu. On exécutait des innocents pour prouver qu'on savait tuer, on fusillait, en rôdant par les campagnes vierges encore de Prussiens, les chiens errants, les vaches ruminant en paix, les chevaux malades pâturant dans les herbages.

This sensitiveness to the misfortunes of others doubtless arose from the writer's own delicate nerves. They made him suffer at times acutely, even pathologically—and not always in social sympathy. One type of this distress is thus described in *Sur l'eau*:

D'ailleurs, j'ai . . . l'horreur des foules. Je ne puis entrer dans un théâtre ni assister à une fête publique. J'y éprouve aussitôt un malaise bizarre, insoutenable, un énervement affreux, comme si je luttais de toute ma force . . . contre l'âme de la foule qui essaye de pénétrer en moi.⁴

University of Colorado Studies, vol. 19, n° 2, April 1932, particularly chapter IV, pp. 145-150.

² *Sur l'eau*, Paris, Marpon et Flammarion, s. d., pp. 70-80.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 77, 78.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

On the same point *La vie errante*, discussing the author's general acute sensibilities, asks:

Ne pas pouvoir entrer dans une salle de théâtre, parce que le contact des foules agite inexplicablement l'organisme entier, ne pas pouvoir pénétrer dans une salle de bal parce que la gaieté banale et le mouvement tournoyant des valseuses irrite comme une insulte—est-ce un bonheur ou un malheur? ⁵

These quotations show that Maupassant used himself in part as the chief character in the fictional drama of madness called *Qui sait?* There, the insane person telling the story describes the uneasiness which the continued presence of other human beings causes him:

J'ai vécu seul, sans cesse, par suite d'une sorte de gêne qu'insinue en moi la présence des autres lorsque je les sens depuis longtemps près de moi, même les plus familiers, ils me lassent, me fatiguent, m'énervent, et j'éprouve une envie harcelante de les voir partir ou de m'en aller, d'être seul. Cette envie est plus qu'un besoin, c'est une nécessité irrésistible.

Five paragraphs continue the details of this peculiar affliction.

More significant than these separate subjects, in showing the relationship of the travel works to the short stories, is the undoubted connection which exists between *le Bonheur*, a tale appearing in the collection called *Contes du jour et de la nuit*, put out by Flammarion in 1885, and the description given by Maupassant in *Sur l'eau*, published the preceding year, of a visit he made to a man and wife who lived near Saint Tropez in the département of Var.

In the latter account the author tells how a friend of his had happened upon an old couple in the mountains of southeastern France, north of the sea port already mentioned. The man, totally deaf, was eighty years of age, the woman seventy. They had lived in this rustic retreat like peasants during the many years following their elopement and the husband's desertion from the army, in one of whose regiments he had formerly been an under officer on the woman's father's staff. The friend brings Maupassant in contact with this odd pair who have apparently sacrificed everything for love of each other. The author records his reflections concerning the woman:

⁵ Paris, Ollendorff, 1890, pp. 14, 15.

J'avais contemple, triste, surpris, émerveillé et dégoûté, cette fille qui avait suivi cet homme, ce rustre, séduite par son uniforme de hussard cavalcadeur, et qui plus tard, sous ses haillons de paysan, avait continué de le voir avec le dolman bleu sur le dos, le sabre au flanc, et chaussé de la botte éperonnée qui sonne

Cependant elle était devenue elle-même une paysanne. Au fond de ce désert, elle s'était faite à cette vie sans charmes, sans luxe, sans délicatesse d'aucune sorte, elle s'était pliée à ces habitudes simples. Elle n'avait jamais pensé à rien, qu'à lui! Elle n'avait regretté ni les parures, ni les étoffes, ni les élégances, ni la mollesse des sièges, ni la tiédeur parfumée des chambres enveloppées de tentures, ni la douceur des duvets où plongent les corps pour le repos. Elle avait abandonné la vie, toute jeune, et le monde, et ceux qui l'avaient élevée, aimée. Elle était venue, seule avec lui, en ce sauvage ravin.*

In *le Bonheur*, the scene is shifted to Corsica, but the essential groundwork of fact remains unchanged. The couple have run away from a town where the wife's father was commanding a regiment in which the husband served as a "sous-officier de hussards." The detail as to the old gentleman's deafness persists. Both parties are described as oldsters, though the man's age is now given as eighty-two. Maupassant's remarks about the woman lover resemble very closely those made on the same subject in *Sur l'eau*:

Elle était devenue elle-même une paysanne. Elle s'était faite à sa vie sans charmes, sans délicatesse d'aucune sorte, elle s'était pliée à ses habitudes simples. . . . Elle n'avait jamais pensé à rien, qu'à lui! Elle n'avait regretté ni les parures, ni les étoffes, ni les élégances, ni la mollesse des sièges, ni la tiédeur parfumée des chambres enveloppées de tentures, ni la douceur des duvets où plongent les corps pour le repos. Elle avait abandonné la vie jeune, et le monde, et ceux qui l'avaient élevée, aimée. Elle était venue, seule avec lui, en ce sauvage ravin.

Only—the travel work contains a sad sequel, entirely omitted from *le Bonheur*. On a second visit to the aged folks Maupassant hears that the old lady, on learning, at this advanced age, that her husband has not made a complete sacrifice of himself but has had a mistress in the nearby village for thirty years, has committed suicide by jumping from her attic window. The husband, because of his deafness, never learns the true cause of her death.⁷

The differences between the actual facts of the case as recorded in *Sur l'eau* and the fictionized version of them in *le Bonheur* emphasize Maupassant's artistry. The short story remains closely-knit, and the picture of an ideal attachment, a sort of hymn to

* Pp. 211, 212.

⁷ Pp. 222-225.

love at its highest peak of devotion. The account of the real affair contains details unfavorable to the two lovers, the woman's lack of intelligence, the husband's unfaithfulness. In other words, we are there presented with the authentic bitter-sweet of real life, which because of its differing elements fails to produce the strongly unified impression, the heavy emotional pull, required by art. Realizing this, Maupassant created a work of high aesthetic value in *le Bonheur* by resolving all the conflicts of its original factual background into a practically perfect unity.

G. M. FESS

The University of Missouri

A GRANT TO 'HUDIBRAS' BUTLER

Apparently no notice has been taken of the fact that on May 10, 1680, Henry Guy, Esq. was commanded by Charles II to pay £20 "To Samuel Butler, as of free gift and royal bounty." The grant was made from the secret service money and is to be found recorded in the Camden Society publication, *Moneys Received and Paid for Secret Services of Charles II. and James II.: From 30th March, 1679, to 25th December, 1688*, edited by John Yonge Akerman. Curiously enough, as the editor points out, secret services include chiefly work connected with keeping up the royal estates as well as any sort of services to the crown rather than what one would expect. Many of the payments indeed are merely gifts. In any case, coming as it did about four months before the satirist's death on September 25, 1680, the grant to Butler makes one even more skeptical of the legends concerning his death in abject poverty.

NORMA E. BENTLEY

Syracuse University

OMISSIONS AND ADDITIONS TO *FIFTY YEARS OF MOLIÈRE STUDIES*

The following list of books and articles on Molière brings up to date this bibliography.¹ In addition to the material published in the two years since the terminal date of the volume, the list includes certain earlier items not noted there. The authors wish to thank reviewers of their book for bringing to their attention such omissions, and hope to be able to incorporate all new material in a later edition of the book. The new items have been classified according to contents and have been given a number indicating their proper position in the bibliography. Articles included in the original volume which have since re-appeared in some later publication are given the original entry number.

It is significant that even during these war years interest in Molière has not lessened. Two new biographies have appeared, and several scholarly articles have furthered the study and appreciation of Molière's work. When communications with France are once more established, it is probable that many more articles on Molière will have to be added to complete the bibliography.

- 2a. BRISSON, PIERRE. Molière, sa vie dans ses ouvrages. Paris. Gallimard, 1942.* [Printed in Canada for Les Éditions Variétés, 1943], 316 p.
- 6a. CHARPENTIER, JOHN. Molière. Paris. Tallandier, 1942.*
- 139a. LANCASTER, HENRY CARRINGTON. "An actress: La Du Parc" In *his* Adventures of a literary historian: a collection of his writings. . . . Baltimore. Johns Hopkins, 1942, 79-96.
- 340a. LANCASTER, HENRY CARRINGTON. "Boileau's propaganda for Molière and his Troupe." In *M. L. Q.*, iv (1943), 157-160.
- 341. [LANCASTER, HENRY CARRINGTON] Also in *his* Adventures of a literary historian; a collection of his writings. . . . Baltimore. Johns Hopkins, 1942, 317-320.
- 523a. CHENES, A. "La commedia dell' arte e Molière." In *his* Poesia epica e poesia romanzesca. Catania. S. Bargagallo, 1921, 36-41.*
- 534a. GIOBERTI, V. "Pascal e Molière" In *his* Scritti letterari. Torino: Libreria Sciolto già Vaccarino, 1877, 278-285.*

¹ *Fifty Years of Molière Studies: a Bibliography, 1892-1941*, by PAUL SAINTONGE and ROBERT W. CHRIST. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1942, 313 pp.

- 546a LEVI, CESARE "Il teatro in Francia dalle origini all' epoca di Luigi XIV Molière e la commedia del seicento" *In his Letteratura drammatica* Milano Hoepli, 1900, 89-108 *
- 571a WADSWORTH, CHARLOTTE LOUISE La dette de Molière à Montaigne, ses idées et ses oeuvres (M.A. Thesis, Mount Holyoke College) South Hadley, Mass. Unpublished, 1943, 144 p.
- 616a. CHESSEX, JEAN CHARLES "Les intentions de Molière" *In M L Q*, IV(1) (1943), 27-47.
- 619a. DANDOLO, TULLIO "Molière" *In his Storia del pensiero nei tempi moderni* Milano Schieppatta, 1864, II 57-76 *
698. [KÖHLER, PIERRE] cf. FLORA, FRANCESCO *In La Critica*, rivista di letteratura, storia e filosofia, diretta da B. Croce (Rome), XXIV (1926), 179-181
- 702a. LANCASTER, HENRY CARRINGTON "Molière; Molière's rivals; Molière's successors" *In his A history of French dramatic literature in the seventeenth century. Part V. Recapitulation, 1610-1700* Baltimore Johns Hopkins, 1942, 102-117, 118-129, 130-142.
- 703 [LANCASTER, HENRY CARRINGTON] *Also in his Adventures of a literary historian, a collection of his writings. . . .* Baltimore Johns Hopkins, 1942, 307-316.
- 757a. PADOVAN, ADOLFO "Molière" *In his Il libro del buon umore* Milano. Bottega dei Poesia, 1926, 139-143 *
- 811a. TURNELL, MARTIN. "Molière" *In Horizon*; a review of literature and art (London), VIII (1943), 162-187.
- 844a. FORKEY, LEO ORVILLE. The role of money in French comedy during the reign of Louis XIV. (Ph.D. Thesis, Johns Hopkins University.) Baltimore. Unpublished, 1942, 232 p.
- 844b. FRANCISCI, C. "Molière et la société." *In his Fantaisies littéraires* Perugia: V. Bartelli, 1902, 37-41.*
- 898a. CEUCHET, RENÉ "Les médecins au temps de Molière; les médecins dans les œuvres de Molière" *In his Médecine et littérature. Romance language series, no. 2* Louisiana State University Press, University, La., 1939, 141-172, 173-190.
- 1014a. SCHERER, JACQUES "Sur le sens des titres de quelques comédies de Molière." *In M L N*, LVII (1942), 407-420.
- 1045a. KNIGHTS, LIONEL CHARLES. "Notes on comedy" *In Determination, critical essays by various authors; introduction by F. R. Leavis.* London: Chatto, 1934, 109-131
- 1047 [KÜCHLER, WALTHER.] *See also* CROCE, BENEDETTO. *In La Critica*; rivista di letteratura, storia e filosofia; diretta da B. Croce (Rome), XXVIII (1930), 293-294; *also in his Conversazioni critiche*, 3a serie. Bari: Laterza, 1932, 376-377.
- 1120a. BAUMGARTEN, DINA DORÉ. The battle of the sexes in the comedy of Congreve and Molière. (M.A. Thesis, Mount Holyoke College.) South Hadley, Mass.: Unpublished, 1942, 169 p.
- 1131a. FRANCISCI, C. "Molière et Shakespeare." *In his Fantaisies littéraires* Perugia: V. Bartelli, 1909, 27-33.*

- 1143a KERBY, WILLIAM MOSELEY "Some thoughts concerning Molière and the Restoration drama" *In* M Lang, XXIII (1942), 128-131
- 1259 [RABIZZANI, GIOVANNI] *Also in his* Bozzetti di letteratura italiana e straniera Lanciano R Carabba, 1914, 337-348
Cf no 1264
- 1261a SCHILEO, N "Molière e Goldoni" *In his* Pagine raccolte Treviso L Zoppelli, 1915, 77-82 *
- 1265 [VICO, ALBERTO DE.]
Cf BROGNOLIGO, G "Nuovi studi goldoniani" *In* Fanfulla della domenica (Rome), XXXV (37) (1913), [1]
[Contrasts Vico's opinion with Attilio Momigliano's in his "I limiti dell' arte goldoniana" *In* Scritti vari in onore di Rodolfo Renier Torino Fratelli Bocca, 1912, 79-92]
- 1331a WALDO, LEWIS P The French drama in America in the eighteenth century and its influence on the American drama of that period, 1701-1800 Baltimore Johns Hopkins Press, 1942, xvii, 269 p
- 1660 [LANCASTER, HENRY CARRINGTON] *Also in his* Adventures of a literary historian; a collection of his writings . Baltimore. Johns Hopkins, 1942, 305-307
- 1721a RUDWIN, MAXIMILIEN "Molière" *In his* Les écrivains diaboliques de France. Paris Figuière, 1937, 39
- 1758a JALOUX, EDMOND "Note sur Tartuffe" *In his* L'Esprit des livres Paris Plon, 1923, I 1-9
1859. [LANCASTER, HENRY CARRINGTON] *Also in his* Adventures of a literary historian, a collection of his writings. . . Baltimore Johns Hopkins, 1942, 226-232
- 2023a TURNELL, MARTIN "Le Misanthrope (1)" *In* Scrutiny; a quarterly review (Cambridge), XI (1942/3), 242-258
[To be concluded]
2042. [MAURIAC, FRANÇOIS] *Also in his* Journal II Paris Grasset, 1937, 146-154, and *in his* Journal III. Paris. Grasset, 1940, 91-99.
- 2206a. GIANANI, R "L'Aulularia di Plauto et l'Avaro del Molière" *In his* Saggi critici Catanzaro Stabilimento tipografico calabro, 1922, 31-48.*
2255. [BACCHELLI, R] *Also in his* Confessioni e battaglie. Lanciano Carabba, 1932, 19-117 *
- 2371a. NEEL, FERDINANDO. "La festa di Scapino" *In his* Saggi di letteratura, italiana, francese e inglese Napoli Leffredo, 1936, 221-228 *
- 2371b. PRAGA, MARCO "Le Trapolerie di Scapino" *In his* Cronache teatrali, 1926 Milano: Treves, 1927, 195-197
- 2440a. GOBETTI, PIERO "Extravagantia. l'Ammalato immaginario." *In his* La frusta teatrale. Milano Editoriale Corbaccio, 1923, 137-139.
- 2565 [PROKOSCH, FREDERICK] *Also in* Horizon; a review of literature and art (London), I (1940), 7-8.

3216a [Lord Longford's adaptation of *Tartuffe* at the Gate Theatre, Dublin.] In N Y H T, Nov 22, 1942, vi 12 (Richard Watt)

PAUL SAINTONGE

R. W. CHRIST

Mount Holyoke College

UNE RÉMINISCENCE LATINE DE JEAN-LOUIS GUEZ DE BALZAC

Une lettre de Balzac à son ami M. de la Motte-Aigron, datée de septembre 1622,¹ décrit une campagne où l'auteur se délasse. C'est un morceau de préciosité, plein de lieux-communs, de métaphores et de pointes. Les éditeurs y ont déjà reconnu des pensées empruntées à Justin, à Ovide, à Manilius.² A ces imitations, il en faut ajouter une autre. Ayant décrit, en imitant Justin, l'innocence des paysans que la société n'a pas corrompus, Balzac ajoute: "De sorte qu'en ce Royaume de demie lieue on ne sçait que c'est de tromper que les oyseaux et les bestes, et le style du Palais est une langue aussi inconnuë que celle de l'Amérique, etc." La première moitié de cette phrase, pour banale qu'elle soit, est empruntée, elle aussi. Balzac y imite une jolie épigramme attribuée à Pétrone,³ et où le poète décrit justement, comme Balzac, sa campagne, mais avec une simplicité, un défaut d'affectation, bien éloignés de la prose de notre précieux:

praeterea sive alitibus contexere fraudem
seu magis inbellis libuit circumdare cervos
aut tereti lino pavidum subducere piscem,
hos tantum novere dolos mea sordida rura.

On reconnaît, outre le thème où les seuls animaux sont victimes de la ruse des humains, le thème du "Royaume de demie lieue," *mea sordida rura*.

HENRI SEYRIG

New York City

¹ *Les premières lettres de Guez de Balzac*, éd. Bibas et Butler, Paris, Droz., 1933, I, 133.

² Voir la note de Lanson à cette lettre dans son *Choix de lettres du 17^e siècle*.

³ *Poetae latini minores*, IV, 81.

SAMUEL JOHNSON "MAKING AETHER"

Mrs. Thrale's lively description of Johnson's first meeting with Arthur Murphy throws some light on the lexicographer's study of chemistry. Murphy, calling at the lodgings to apologize for an accidental plagiarism from one of Johnson's works, found him "all covered with soot like a chimney-sweeper, in a little room, with an intolerable heat and strange smell, . . . making *aether*."¹ Although known in the sixteenth century, ether was not usually made by amateurs until Johnson's day, when instructions for its preparation began to appear in non-technical papers. In 1756 the *Literary Magazine* published an article on di-ethyl oxide or sulphuric ether ($C_2H_5OC_2H_5$), with simple instructions on how to prepare it using alcohol and sulphuric acid.² Murphy probably surprised Johnson making either nitrous or sulphuric ether. Both require long steady heating of the retort, which accounts for the soot and the "intolerable heat", and, since both have a high vapor pressure, the smell would be strong and pungent. Both gases are, of course, not only toxic, but highly explosive, and if Johnson often made such things in a small closed chamber, one is moved to wonder how he contrived to die a natural death.

JOHN J. BROWN

Cornell University

¹ *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1897), I, 306. Hill's note, "It was not *aether* but *élixir* that was made," is mistaken.

² *Literary Magazine* (London, 1756), p. 77.

REVIEWS

A History of English Literature. WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY, ROBERT MORSS LOVETT. New and Enlarged Edition. By FRED B. MILLETT. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Pp. xii + 554. \$2.00.

Cavalcade of the English Novel. By EDWARD WAGENKNECHT. New York. Henry Holt and Company, 1943. Pp. xxii + 646. \$2.90.

Professor Millett has become known principally as a redoer and renewer of useful works of reference. The latest editions of *Contemporary British Literature* (1935) and *Contemporary American Authors* (1940) include, moreover, besides their bibliographies and biographical sketches, long "critical surveys" mainly or entirely from his hand. He came, therefore, to the task of revising and extending the Moody and Lovett *History* well prepared by all-round experience, and it can be said at once that his work has been conscientious and skilful, and that he has succeeded in giving the *History* a new lease on life. The book, too, still boasts something of the distinctive quality which set it apart from, and above, competitors when it first appeared in 1902. It was then recognized as having, not only a core of fact adequate for a first connected view of its subject, but a firm and consistent critical outlook, and, above all, a winning and gracious style, direct and vigorous, yet capable of communicating delicate perceptions. The original *History*, indeed, breathed discriminating, lively, and intimate appreciation, and made the study of literature at once delightful and thought-provoking. Such a book could not have been written by anyone as a pot-boiler, or by anyone to whom the stream of literature was just a hunting ground for influences, developments, and other puzzles. It is no secret—it was long ago generously acknowledged by Mr. Lovett—that the *History's* distinction and vitality were imparted to it chiefly by Moody, to whom literature was life, and to whom humanized life was art.

But then the *History* became a valuable piece of property—valuable yet perishable—with the consequence that by 1918 it had to be refurbished. And since then it has been patched and mended and tinkered up every few years, always until the present, sixth edition under the supervision of Mr. Lovett, who, however, had a great deal of help from a number of scholars and assistants. Mr. Millett also has had much help from scholars and assistants, and has not only brought the *History* again up to date, but has extended his revision, as he says, "to include such modifications of interpre-

tation and evaluation as would bring the book into line with the scholarship and criticism of the twentieth century"

The net result is not an unclouded gain. The old *History* is now something of a cross between a sketch and a mosaic, and is on the way to becoming a useful handbook, safe, competent, measurably accurate, informational, impersonal, and with a slant towards the dull side. Its critical bias has been obscured, though not yet obliterated, giving some ground for the suspicion that a ghostly Moody has taken to walking on eggs. Nevertheless, the authentic Moody does survive, so happily and on so many pages that in the end this reviewer felt that Mr. Millett, in his Preface, had done something less than justice to the respect with which he has treated the original text. Despite all his care of every kind, however, Mr. Millett has not wholly succeeded in rooting out obstinate error, just as he has not wholly succeeded in preserving the *History's* original clarity, firmness, and vitality. I cite a few instances

On p. 17, l. 1, the date of Alfred's death should be, almost certainly, 899 (901 is impossible). On p. 26 the first boxed heading should have been altered to conform to the altered text ("Layamon on Himself" would have filled the bill). On p. 40 Mr. Millett says that Chaucer's Pandarus is "as true to type and as vitally alive as Shakespeare's Pandarus." This is a very unhappy change from the original, "a character as true to type and as vitally alive as if Shakespeare had drawn him." On p. 75, l. 24, a comma has wrongly been dropped after "Cranmer"; and a little lower (ll. 28-29) one is sorry to see the barbarous expression "to poeticize prose," needlessly introduced by Mr. Millett. At the top of p. 99 Mr. Millett reverses the estimate in earlier editions of the influence of *Gorboduc's* "classical form," entirely against the evidence. A question may be raised, doubtless, about *Gorboduc* itself, but the influence of "classical form" cannot be waved away. On p. 112 Mr. Millett allows "moonlight" to stand uncorrected (it should be "moonlit"), and on p. 117 he allows Hamlet (l. 2 from bottom) to remain a "youth." At the top of p. 144 the date of Donne's birth is said to be 1572, with no mark of interrogation, though it is equally possible that it was 1571; and Donne is said to have been sent to "Trinity College, Cambridge," with no mention of Oxford. In earlier editions he is said to have been sent to Oxford, with no mention of Cambridge. The substitution of a probable half-truth for a certain half-truth is not an improvement. This reviewer is not steadied in his intellectual by Mr. Millett's introduction (top of p. 149) of a comparison of Vaughan with Blake. The comparison suggests, in fact, lack of real knowledge of both poets. On pp. 189 and 220 Mr. Millett follows the earlier editions in sending first Swift and then Goldsmith to "the University of Dublin," and likewise follows the earlier editions elsewhere in referring to the same institution as "Trinity College." Teachers and students

would have been better served had he stayed his hand at certain other points, and then slashed manfully at this source of confusion;—and had he also expunged the statement (p. 197, ll. 8-11 from bottom) that Swift's "savage" *Letter to a Young Lady* is satiric. On p. 204, l. 4, "As has been said already" refers to a passage in the earlier editions which Mr. Millett omits. On p. 238 Defoe's birth-date should be 1660. On p. 342 Mr. Millett unaccountably omits Jane Austen's dates.

These examples could be continued, though mention even of a few may be misleading. Mr. Millett has, like the rest of us, done things which he ought not to have done and left undone things which he ought to have done; yet despite errors of fact and of judgement, and despite some awkward or slipshod English, he has, on the whole, performed his difficult task competently and with discretion—and performed it quite well enough to keep the *History* a while longer at the top of its kind. It is doubtful, however, if the old book could survive still another feat of plastic surgery.

Professor Wagenknecht's volume, happening to appear simultaneously with Mr. Millett's, exhibits aptly the advantage of the free hand in redoing and renewing. Courses in the novel have become numerous enough in American colleges, and less formal study of fiction in women's clubs, to encourage publishers to compete with each other in offering historical and critical guides. But in this field no one book has yet achieved such eminence as to force its publisher to try to keep it up to the minute as new editions are called for. Hence Mr. Wagenknecht, instead of being asked to refurbish some standard text, was given an opportunity to write an entirely new one, which might supersede not only Raleigh and Wilbur Cross, but also more recent histories or commentaries, such as that of Lovett and Hughes (*History of the Novel in England*, 1932), and Gerould's (*Patterns of English and American Fiction*, 1942), though this appeared too recently to have been taken into account when Mr. Wagenknecht was at work. It is probably easier to achieve substantial accuracy in such a venture than in revising an old book; and Mr. Wagenknecht's success in this respect at least gives support to this opinion. If one has only one's self to reckon with, it is easier also to maintain critical consistency, unity of tone, liveliness, and clarity.

Mr. Wagenknecht is an experienced, careful, and engaging writer, and his *Cavalcade* has the virtues just specified, and others. It is, indeed, clearly the best of its kind, not because of any very striking innovations in arrangement, exposition, or even critical evaluation (Professor Gerould is the innovator), but rather because Mr. Wagenknecht has been able to learn from predecessors how to improve on their work, and because at the same time he has looked on novelists and periods with his own eyes. His comment is fresh, though its setting is familiar.

If any doubts strike readers of the *Cavalcade*, they will be doubts which might equally well have been suggested by other recent textbooks. Still, two may be set down. The *Cavalcade* runs to over 600 rather large pages, and Mr. Wagenknecht announces in his Preface that he is preparing a companion study of the American novel. Treatment as well as scale must force teachers to ask anxiously if they really want students to read Wagenknecht *instead of* some of the fiction he describes and discusses. In the second place, we get as far as Scott in the *Cavalcade* by p. 152, and we reach Barrie and Kipling before we reach p. 400. It is seriously disturbing to see how textbooks and teachers today are conspiring to centre study in very recent or contemporary literature. Do we really want to co-operate with those who are fostering the growth of ignorance? Two of the most effective methods known to this reviewer for promoting uneducation are, (1) the transformation of humanistic studies into information-subjects, sprinkled with dashes of ready-made opinion, and (2) confinement of attention and interest to the productions of our own time. "Shakespeare," said a Middle-Western Master of Arts in English the other day, "is dreadfully remote." She seemed to feel that in studying him as he is now taught she had wasted her time in mere antiquarianism.

ROBERT SHAFER

University of Cincinnati

Religious Trends in English Poetry, Volume II 1740-1780, Religious Sentimentalism in the Age of Johnson. By HOXIE NEALE FAIRCHILD. New York. Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 406. \$5.00.

The first volume of Mr. Fairchild's study, which appeared in 1939, dealt with the religious trends in English poetry between 1700 and 1740. The present volume, the second in what promises to be a five-volume work, moves on to the Age of Johnson.

In my comment on Vol. I—in *MLN* for February, 1941—I described Mr. Fairchild's method of assembling a body of pertinent verse. The same method has here been followed, and with similar results. Though Mr. Fairchild cites only such verse writers as illustrate in one way or another the religious trends of the time, his bibliography of primary sources will be of great assistance to anyone concerned with the body of verse turned out in England between 1740 and 1780.

Readers familiar with the earlier volume will find the theories of English culture there set forth restated and emphasized anew in the light of later developments. "In the eighteenth century as a whole," writes Mr. Fairchild (p. 191), "the main stream of poetic

response to religious thought and feeling descends from seventeenth-century Protestantism through latitudinarianism to a definitely non-Christian sentimentalism." And most of the writers cited in this volume are discussed in respect of this "sentimentalism," shown to be of various kinds and degrees but always stemming from the essentially non-Catholic culture of England and illustrating in manifold ways a temperament and attitude which the author, speaking as an Anglo-Catholic, believes bound to result from an abandonment of religious orthodoxy. It is, furthermore, an essential part of the author's theory of history that "the religion of sentiment goes hand in hand with those literary tendencies which students of the period label 'preromantic'" (p. 366).

The statement of the development of English culture in the eighteenth century which Mr. Fairchild has now built up seems, to put it as briefly and simply as possible, lamentably out of focus. In saying this, the present reviewer has not the slightest desire to challenge Mr. Fairchild's Anglo-Catholic point of view. But surely, no matter from what point of view a history of culture and literature is written, one may insist upon certain things. One may insist, for instance, that the historian proceed upon a carefully chosen and rigorously defined level of analysis; if he must from time to time shift to a different level, this shift must be made explicit. Mr. Fairchild works at many different levels: textual commentary, commentary on the personalities of the writers, cultural development in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, religious development, and a normative standard of religious experience and expression. The blurred picture which emerges is the result of Mr. Fairchild's unhappy faculty of writing about a poem or a poet or more intangible things like "sentimentalism" or "romanticism" from just as many levels as will enable him to enforce certain predetermined theories and judgments.

Consider, for example, the statement on p. 365 regarding eighteenth-century medievalism. Mr. Fairchild, by linking seventeenth-century Protestantism, eighteenth-century sentimentalism, and nineteenth-century romanticism, presents us with a historical statement which purports to coordinate literary, cultural, and religious developments and values. But it is a closed statement—any event that does not fit is to be made forcibly to fit. "The Protestant background of the religion of sentiment," we read, "is no less obvious in the later than in the earlier period. The striking development of preromantic medievalism during the Age of Johnson may seem to introduce a discordant factor. This tendency, however, implies no more than a desire for emotional stimulation by the strange and the remote. If contact with the Middle Ages had inspired in Gothacists like Thomas Warton the most lukewarm affection for Holy Church, the Incarnation, the Virgin Mary, the priesthood, or the sacrament of the altar, one would grant that a Catholic influence

was at work upon them." It is simply not true—in accord, that is, with the known facts—that this medievalism "implies no more than a desire for emotional stimulation. . . ." What Mr. Fairchild means basically, and what anybody would grant him, is that these men were not converted to Anglo-Catholicism. But their medievalism *implies* a great many things, some of them—for instance—essentially linguistic.

Take, again, Mr. Fairchild's concluding statement (p. 363) regarding Gray: "The chief conclusion to be drawn from Gray's writings is that once sentimentalism has taken definite form its literary media may be cultivated by a conscious artist who has no religion worth mentioning sentimental or otherwise." The five pages of analysis preceding this final résumé offer a fair example of Mr. Fairchild's perverse methods. Biographical odds and ends, inference, generalization—these are fitted together to give us the degree of Gray's irreligion. Thirteen lines of Gray are then quoted as a reminder of the spiritual barrenness of his poetry. And then the "chief conclusion," hopelessly implicating the unfortunate poet in those two vast historical themes, sentimentalism and decaying Protestantism, which taken together are to explain most of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in England.

These two instances of confused treatment might be multiplied many times. Conclusions and generalizations arrived at in such a quixotic manner can scarcely be compelling.

RICARDO QUINTANA

The University of Wisconsin

The Vita Sancti Malchi of Reginald of Canterbury. A Critical Edition, with Introduction, Apparatus Criticus, Notes, and Indices, by LEVI ROBERT LIND. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1942. 245 pp.

The *Vita Sancti Malchi* of Reginald of Canterbury is a religious epic of 3344 rhymed hexameters, written near the beginning of the twelfth century by a French-born monk of St. Augustine's Abbey. Its subject is the life and temptations of a Syrian hermit named Malchus, of whom Jerome once wrote a short biography. The poem has almost no literary merit, being a tasteless conglomeration of hagiography, description, apostrophes, prayers, mythology, and digressions of every sort. Yet it is valuable for the light it throws on the state of English culture in the decades following the Norman Conquest.

The volume at hand, a critical *editio princeps* of the *Vita*, provides both a sound text and an exhaustive analysis of the poem and its background. In his Introduction Professor Lind devotes sepa-

rate sections to Reginald's life, to the content, nature, and sources of the *Vita*, to the manuscripts and their relationship, to the principles of spelling and punctuation followed in the text, and to a printing of two prose pieces by Reginald, his letter to Baldwin of Rochester and his "De Intentione in Sequentem Librum," both found in a twelfth-century manuscript of the poem which was evidently prepared as a gift copy.

Lind's text is based chiefly on this manuscript (Bodl. Laud. Misc. 40), though with a full collation of six others from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Of the subsidiary versions, the most interesting is one of 1076 lines (Oxon., Coll. Mertonensis 241, fols. 2-17v), which Lind believes is a copy of Reginald's first draft. It corresponds closely with Jerome's prose life of Malchus and may be regarded as the plot framework which Reginald was later to elaborate "in keeping with . . . the convention of verbosity common to such pieces of Medieval Latin literature" (p. 36). Besides printing this manuscript as a supplement, Lind includes its line-numbering on the pages of the main text, thus enabling the reader to see where Reginald expanded his original outline. In addition, pertinent passages from Jerome's *Life of Malchus* appear above the apparatus criticus, completing a text page that is highly efficient.

The material in the Notes and Addenda is of two kinds: contemporary interpretation of the *Vita* in the form of marginal and interlinear glosses found in the manuscripts; and Lind's own commentary, including the identification of sources, translation of difficult passages, lexicographical data, and comments on Reginald's prosody. The notes are full and exact, providing a clear picture of Reginald's Latin and of his indebtedness to Hildebert of Le Mans, the Bible, Martianus Capella, Ambrosius, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Persius, Terence, and Lucan.

The volume closes with an extensive bibliography and two word lists, an *Index Nominum* and an *Index Verborum Selectorum et Graecismorum*. These sections show the same careful workmanship as the rest of the book, rounding out an edition that should be gratefully received by all mediaevalists. The *Vita Sancti Malchi* may not be great literature, but it nevertheless is a significant document. Professor Lind has performed a useful service in making it available for further study.

PUTNAM FENNELL JONES

University of Pittsburgh

The Forgotten Hume Le Bon David. By ERNEST CAMPBELL MOSSNER New York Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. xv + 251. \$3 00.

Professor Mossner thinks that as a person the "historical Hume is the equal of Johnson, morally as good, humanly as lovable" The object of his book is to revive some of the respect and affection which Hume's intimates had for him, not as a philosopher (they nearly all rejected his philosophy) but as a human being. He narrates in successive chapters Hume's persistent and disinterested efforts to launch the Scottish poets Blacklock, Home, Wilkie, and Macpherson, shows, by reviewing his controversy with the Rev. Robert Wallace, how candid and good-tempered he was; re-tells the old story of the quarrel with Rousseau; presents the first extended account of his relations with Boswell, and ends with a contrast between Hume and Johnson which furnishes the thesis for the entire book. Hume is very much alive as a philosopher, but the advantage is still on Johnson's side, for he is known also as a man. Hume was a placid, gentle, kind-hearted, affectionate man. Why is he not widely known as such? Perhaps he would be if Boswell had written his biography—and Boswell began recording Hume's conversation some months before he met Johnson.

Professor Mossner has not made clear who it is he is talking to. It does not appear that Hume *has* ever been "forgotten" by those who have read systematically in the letters and memoirs of the eighteenth century. Leslie Stephen's article in the *D.N.B.* says for him just what Professor Mossner does. I suppose he wishes a wider sympathy, wants literate people in general to be aware of Hume as a personality, as they are of Johnson.

They never will be, and it would not have made much difference if Boswell had written his biography. Personalities of the past do not survive merely because they were good or wise or kind-hearted. They survive, if they were soldiers or statesmen, because they performed heroic actions or could become the subject of heroic legends; they survive, if they were men of letters, because they were picturesque and dramatic because, like Walter Scott, they wrote novels anonymously and failed for a million dollars; because, like Johnson, they were formidable and unpredictable, given to eccentric habits, and endowed with the gift of memorable speech. A man of letters whose life is placid and prosperous, who avoids controversy and practices unflinching good humor, may purchase present peace of mind, but he has dropped out of the race for personal notoriety. Hume would have admitted as much and would have added that he did not care in the least. I shall not attempt to assess the further handicap furnished by Hume's skepticism, but that in itself may well be insuperable. The world, even when it parades its own skepticism, is loath to take a skeptic to its heart.

Professor Mossner's book is well written and entertaining. It is moreover learned, presenting the results of a good deal of research in original sources. It would be more persuasive if he did not so constantly write as advocate for the defense, and resort so often to special pleading.

Yale University

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

BRIEF MENTION

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, xxviii (1942). Collected by R. W. CHAPMAN. Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York Oxford University Press], 1943. Pp. 83. \$2.50. Contains "Alfred the Scribe" by N. R. Ker, "Marching Song" by J. A. Chapman, "The Action of Comus" by E. M. W. Tillyard, "An Addition to the Canon of Johnson's Writings" by L. F. Powell (Preface to the first Index to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, which exists in two forms, 1753 and 1789), "Harmonious Jones" by R. M. Hewitt, "*Balder Dead*, 1855" by Frederick Page ("Balder is Christianity as it has fared among men. Lok is the critical spirit. . . . Hoder . . . is popular opinion"; influenced by *Heroes and Hero-Worship*), "The Love Poetry of Thomas Hardy" by V. H. Collins (chiefly the *Poems of 1912-18*, which deal with his first wife). Mr. Tillyard's contention, which seems to me over-subtle and tenuous, is that passages in the 1637 *Comus* which are not found in the manuscript were added to indicate that neither Comus nor the lady were right in their dispute as to chastity. Marriage is the solution. Mr. Hewitt's article, which is both interesting and valuable, shows that Sir William Jones's *Persian Grammar* is the first English work to stress the value of oriental poetry as poetry. He examines Jones's original verse, which is of little significance, with some care and remarks that Jones "preferred Shakespeare's sonnets to those of Petrarch." It is to be wished that he had given us the date of this utterance and the reference, for it may well be the first recorded praise of Shakespeare's sonnets in the eighteenth century.

R. D. H.

Acrology

EDWARD COOK ARMSTRONG

Edward Cook Armstrong died in his home at Princeton on March 5. He was co-editor of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES from 1911 to 1915. Long before that, he had assisted in editorial work on the journal, for which he wrote more than thirty articles, reviews, and notices. After he resigned from the editorial board, he continued his friendly interest, contributing articles to the magazine as recently as 1942. Several of the editors and many of the contributors have been his students or colleagues. To them his keen understanding, his accurate knowledge, and his high standard of scholarship meant much. As a professor for twenty years at the Johns Hopkins and for twenty-six at Princeton, as the editor of the Elliott Monographs, as an active member of the Modern Language Association, of which he was president in 1918-1919, of the American Council of Learned Societies, whose chairman he was in 1929-1935, and as a fellow of the American Philosophical Society, the Medieval Academy, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, he exerted influence throughout the country. His chief publications lay in the field of Old French. *Le Chevalier à l'épée* appeared in 1900; *Barlaam et Josaphat*, in 1922. He organized at Princeton a group of scholars who devoted themselves to the Alexander corpus. Their labors have already resulted in the publication, with his guidance, of fourteen volumes. His life developed as a scholar's should. He helped the teacher of undergraduates with his *Syntax of the French Verb*. He contributed to knowledge of his subject by his own learned publications and by editing those of others. He aided in the selection of teachers, in promoting the work of organizations that give help and encouragement to scholarship, and he undertook one of the few large Romance enterprises that have been fathered in America. His fine achievement will be recognized by all who work in his field. He would have liked those who had the privilege of knowing him to show their appreciation of our loss by imitating his high purpose and his untiring devotion to the tasks that he undertook.

H. C. L.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

MAY, 1944

Number 5

MAK AND ARCHIE ARMSTRANG

Almost half a century ago a German scholar, Professor Eugen Kolbing of Breslau, pointed out the hitherto unnoticed, and highly interesting parallels between the well-known "Mak" episode in the *Secunda Pastorum* of the Towneley Cycle and a modern ballad, *Archie Armstrong's Aith*, in *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (*Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, Neue Folge, *Elfter Band*, 1897). He noted briefly, but correctly, that the main difference between the two lay in the conclusion, since in the play the thief is caught and punished, while in the ballad he outwits the shepherds and accomplishes an apparently impossible vow. The question which of these conclusions preserved the original form of the tale Dr. Kolbing held to be unanswerable with any degree of certainty. It is part of the purpose of this note to show that there is good reason for believing that an answer can be given.

Dr. Kolbing further remarked with perfect justice that it was most unlikely that the Reverend John Marriott, the author of the ballad, had acquired his knowledge of the story which he versified from the at that time unprinted Towneley Cycle, first published by the Surtees Society, 1836, i. e. eleven years after Marriott's death, and suggested that the original of both play and poem was an old tradition handed down orally, possibly in verse form. This suggestion may be regarded as a practical certainty, but Dr. Kolbing did not proceed to draw, as he might have done, an interesting consequence therefrom.

The article was promptly "englisht"—the spelling is Furnivall's—in an incomplete and emended form, and appended to Pollard's introduction to a new edition of the *Towneley Plays* (Early English Text Society, 1897). Dr. Furnivall, who collaborated with Pollard in this edition, inserted in the "englishing" a phrase which sug-

gested that if the author of the ballad had actually borrowed the story from the Towneley play the whole of his [Marriott's] note would be a forgery. He added also a note of his own to the effect that Scotch shepherds would never have thought of presenting sixpence to the supposed child in the cradle. Both the insertion and Furnivall's note call for a brief comment.

In the first place the note to which Furnivall alludes is *not* Marriott's but, as we shall see, Walter Scott's, the compiler and editor of the *Minstrelsy*. Further the shepherds were not Scotch as Furnivall suggests, but, as a glance at the text would have shown him, good Yorkshire men. Whether Yorkshire shepherds would have been stingier with sixpences than their Scotch fellows is a question which an American is quite unable to decide. The lamented Eric Knight might perhaps have given the correct answer.

The *Secunda Pastorum* has been reprinted many times since its appearance in the Surtees edition, but, so far as I know, there has been no reference since Pollard's introduction to Marriott's ballad and its relation to the "Mak" episode. It seems worth while therefore to review the matter and to draw certain hitherto neglected conclusions.

Dr Kolbing's information about Marriott, drawn, he says, from Alibone's *Dictionary*, is singularly incomplete. Had he consulted the *DNB.*, of which the required volume, xxxvi, was already in print, 1893, he would have found the following interesting facts. John Marriott, 1780-1825, educated at Rugby and Christ Church, Oxford, came in 1804 to Dalkeith in Eskdale to act as tutor to George Henry, Lord Scott, heir to the dukedom of Buccleuch. Here he remained until his pupil's untimely death in 1808 when he retired to an English rectory the gift of the Buccleuch family. During this time he came to know and indeed to become on intimate terms with Walter Scott, then living at Ashestiel "in the heart of the Buccleuch estates." It was to Marriott that Scott addressed the Epistle prefixed to the second canto of *Marmion*, 1808, in which he records their walks and talks, "in Classic and in Gothic lore" and remarks that his friend's harp "on Isis strung to many a Border theme has rung." The allusion is, of course, to Marriott's contributions to the *Minstrelsy* and here comes a fact which enables us to date the composition of *Archie Armstrong's Aith* almost to a year. Dr. Kolbing stated that this poem appeared in the fifth

edition of the *Minstrelsy*, 1826. So, indeed, it does, but it had appeared long before, namely in the third edition, 1806, along with another Border ballad by Marriott, *The Feast of Spurs*, and a lyric addressed to the countess of Dalkeith, mother of his pupil, on the occasion of her visit to the ruins of Melrose Abbey.¹ On the basis of his information Dr. Kolbing argued that the ballad could hardly have been composed before 1802, when *The Minstrelsy* first appeared. It is now possible to date it more exactly between 1804 when Marriott came to Scotland and 1806 when Scott included it in the third volume of the third edition of *The Minstrelsy*. It has appeared in all succeeding editions down to the elaborate four volume edition by Henderson in 1902, and it was in the fifth edition, 1821, that Dr. Kolbing came upon it.

The note appended to the ballad in all editions of the *Minstrelsy* is, of course, like all other notes in the collection, by Scott himself, not, as Furnivall seems to have guessed, by Marriott. There is no reference in it to the Towneley play, of which, in fact, there is no reason to suppose that Scott had any knowledge whatever. It is worth while to summarize the important statements in this note of Scott's. "The hero of that ballad," he says, "was a native of Eskdale"—that is in the district where Scott himself was then living—"and contributed not a little toward the raising his clan to that pre-eminence which it long maintained among the Border thieves, . . . at length he found it expedient to emigrate. . . . He afterwards became a celebrated jester in the English Court." Scott identifies, that is, the "hero" with the well-known Archie Armstrong, Court Fool to James I and Charles I; the last stanza of the ballad with its reference to "Charlie, the English King" makes his identification complete.² Scott continues: "The exploit detailed in

¹ This lyric, by the way, is wrongly called a "ballad" in the *Bibliography of the Poetical Works of Walter Scott* (Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions, Vol. I, 1936).

² According to *DNB.*, Archie, date of birth unknown, died in 1672. The author of this article quotes Scott's note for Archie's reputation as a sheep-stealer, but adds that "he was attached at an early age to the household of James VI of Scotland. On his accession to the English throne Armstrong accompanied the King." That, of course, would be in 1603 and if we allow Archie to have been fifteen years old at this time, he must have made his reputation as a thief at a very early age indeed. Certainly he did not find it "expedient to emigrate" but went to England as a member of the royal

this ballad has been preserved . . . by tradition and is at this time current in Eskdale" It is, I think, a perfectly fair inference that the "tradition" was discovered by Scott in one of his many "Border raids" to gather material for the *Minstrelsy* and handed over by him to Marriott to versify. This was almost certainly the case with Marriott's other contribution, *The Feast of Spars*, since that ballad deals with a story told of Walter Scott of Harden, a character who appears in *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*. The "identification" which Kolbing supposed to have taken place in the seventeenth century, so as to connect the "hero" with the Court Fool of Charles I, is in all probability the work of Scott himself who padded out his note by including a jest of the Fool which brought about his disgrace at Court.

Since the Towneley Ms in which the *Secunda Pastorum* appears was written, according to E. K. Chambers, in the second half of the fifteenth century it is certain that the "tradition," "current in Eskdale" and Scott's time, and the original of both play and ballad is older than the Ms. Is it not possible to show that the modern ballad preserves a form closer to the "tradition" than that which appears in the play? I believe it is.

Let us consider the main outline of the ballad. Archie—the name Armstrong does not appear in the text—with a stolen sheep on his shoulder reaches his home, hotly pursued by the shepherds. His wife warns him that he will be "ta'en the night, and hangit in the morning," but Archie has a trick up his sleeve, he skins the sheep, wraps the carcase in a blanket, and puts it in the cradle of a child which happens to be absent. When the shepherds enter they find him rocking the cradle and crooning "hushabye," to a bairn, "just at the dying" To their charge of theft he replies with a stout denial and with the imprecation that he may be doomed to eat the flesh in the cradle if ever he stole a sheep. After a fruitless search of his house the shepherds depart feeling that there has been some mistake, and Archie to keep his vow "ate the cradled sheep."

All this, it may be noted, is quite in the tone of the Border ballads. They all tend to glorify the daring and craft of the border reiver, whether an Englishman, like Dick o' the Cow, or a Scottish

household. It seems most likely that when Scott discovered the tradition about the sheep-stealing Armstrong—Archie or otherwise—he promptly and wrongly identified him with the famous Court Fool

rascal like the Harper of Lochmaben who stole the Lord Warden's Wanton Broun. Cattle-lifting, horse-stealing, jail-breaking are laudable exploits to be commemorated in story and in song. There can be little doubt that Marriott did little but versify the "current tradition" which Scott passed on to him.

The Mak episode in the Townely play on the other hand differs from the ballad not only in the conclusion where the thief is detected and punished, but in the very beginning and in various details in the course of the action. Mak, the "hero," introduces himself to the shepherds as a poor man staggering under the burden of superfluous children. In spite of his bad reputation as a sheep-stealer he is hospitably received and lies down to sleep with them. He casts a spell on them, steals a sheep, and takes it home, where Gill, his wife, a worthy mate, quite unlike the frightened woman of the ballad, suggests a trick: the sheep can be hidden in the cradle as a new-born babe, while she lies and groans in a feigned child bed. He returns to the sleeping shepherds and is, apparently, the last to wake in the morning; he then tells them of a dream in the night that his wife has just added a boy to his houseful of children. He departs in peace and at home places the sheep in the cradle, haps his wife in bed, and sits down to sing "lullaby" in anticipation of the shepherds' visit. They are not long in coming, for the loss of a sheep has been discovered and suspicion falls, of course, on Mak. He protests his innocence and laying his hand on the cradle prays that this, the hidden sheep, may be the first meal that he eats, a vow which is echoed by his wife: "I pray to God—if ever I you beguiled that I may eat this child that lies in this cradle." After a vain search of the house the shepherds are departing when the gentlest among them returns to give the new-born babe a gift of sixpence. He lifts up the sheet and discovers the stolen sheep. In spite of the frantic protestations of Mak and his wife that the child has been "changed" by an elf, the truth comes out, the thief is let off with the easy penalty of a tossing in a blanket, and the shepherds return to hear the "Gloria in excelsis" of the Christmas angel.

The points of likeness between the ballad and the play are, as Dr. Kolbing pointed out, unmistakable and since, in the nature of the case, neither could have been derived from the other, it follows that both derive from a common origin, the "tradition" which, as

Scott testified, still lingered in Eskdale. What differentiates ballad and play is the treatment that each accords to this common source. That of Marriot's poem, written under the inspiration of Scott, is simple and direct in true ballad fashion; that of the play is artful, not to say sophisticated, with all the tricks of a practiced playwright foreshadowing, complication, suspense, and solution. And so indeed it is, for the *Secunda Pastorum* is one of a group of plays in the Towneley Cycle which have been identified as the work of one man, the so-called Wakefield Master, a witty clerk of the time of Chaucer.

It seems highly probable that this worthy was entrusted some time in the late fourteenth century with the job of freshening up the old cycle of Towneley plays for one of their annual performances at the Wakefield Fair. To do this he altered and improved various pageants and composed several new ones, among these that which goes under the name of *Prima Pastorum*. Now this *Prima* is a perfectly satisfactory play as old Miracles go, better in many ways than its companion play in the York cycle. It is a vigorous bit of realism with English shepherds grouching, quarreling over imaginary sheep, eating and drinking like good fellows, before they hear the angel's song. What could have induced the Master to write a *Secunda* to take its place and to become the outstanding example of English comedy before Elizabethan days?

It would seem as if there could be but one answer. In the interval between a performance of the *Prima* and the composition of the *Secunda*, the Master must have come upon an early form of the "tradition" that Scott discovered centuries later still current in Eskdale. Here, he saw at a glance, was the very thing to make a new and merrier Shepherds' play. The story was, in fact, the sort of grotesque parody of the Gospel narrative that medieval art delighted in; the Shepherds would visit the house of the robber and be deceived by a false child in the cradle before they entered the stable at Bethlehem and adored the true Babe in the manger. Only one thing, it may be, troubled the Master. The tradition, no doubt, credited the robber with a successful trick upon the silly shepherds. This, he felt, would never do for a Christmas play. He could not allow his shepherds, who were soon to receive the new message of

the new born Saviour, to be imposed upon by a neighbor² And so he was compelled by the very nature of the case to alter the ending and expose the trick. Yet he could not, on the other hand, permit his shepherds of the Nativity to stain their hands with blood, and so, in spite of a cry of one shepherd for weapons, and the threat of another to kill both Mak and his wife, the Master dismisses the thief with a bit of the rough horse play that his audience loved. Here it would seem is the answer to the question that Dr. Kolbing found insoluble. It is impossible, I think, to believe that the Mak episode represents the original form of the tradition and that the simpler and in fact more primitive story in the ballad is a distortion of the original. If for no other reason, and there are many, the matter of the oath speaks against such a conclusion. In the form presented in the ballad this oath, to eat the flesh in the cradle, is the very keystone of the structure. It gives the title which Marriott affixed to his version; it is the means by which the "hero" ratifies his trick to deceive his accusers, and when he is free of their presence he keeps the vow by eating the sheep. In the play, on the other hand, the oath, though present, is hardly noted in the lively patter of dialogue between Mak and Gill and the shepherds, in the wails of Gill from her childbed, in the friendly inquiries as to the child's gossips, and in the vain attempts to pass off the discovered sheep as a changeling child. Needless to say when the shepherds leave Mak's house there is no further mention of the oath. We may suppose, if we like, that Mak comforted his sore bones with a hot bowl of mutton broth. The Master does not say so; his business as a playwright was to get the shepherds to Bethlehem as soon as possible, lest he tire his hearers with a performance already enlarged beyond the normal length. In other words what was the keystone of the old tradition became in the playwright's hands only matter for a momentary jest.

If this interpretation of the relation of the ballad and the play to their common source be the true answer to the question that Kolbing left unsolved it does something more than merely establish

² It is wrong to think with Wulcker, and others, of Mak as a Scotchman. His patronymic, indeed, suggests a Scotchman to us; but the English borderers then and long after were far more familiar with Johnstones, Armstrongs, and Ellots than with MacGregors or MacDonalds who had not yet descended from their mountain homes to harry the Lowlands.

the ballad as standing closer to the original form. It reveals the Wakefield Master as a dramatist who in his choice of subject, his freedom in handling his material, and his lively *vis comica* stands head and shoulders above all English playwrights up to and even past the time of Heywood.

T. M. PARROTT

Lawrenceville, N J

THE FIRE SYMBOLISM IN *MOBY DICK*

A critical passage in *Moby Dick* occurs toward the end of the story, when Ahab grasps the links of the lightning chain, places his foot upon the kneeling body of Fedallah, and addresses the corpusants (St. Elmo's fire) burning from the tips of the spars.

Oh! thou clear spirit of clear fire, whom on these seas I as Persian, once did worship, till in the sacramental act so burned by thee, that to this hour I bear the scar, I now know thee, thou clear spirit, and I now know that thy right worship is defiance. To neither love nor reverence wilt thou be kind, and e'en for hate thou canst but kill; and all are killed. No fearless fool now fronts thee. I own thy speechless, placeless power; but to the last gasp of my earthquake life will dispute its unconditional, unintegral mastery in me (Ch. CXXIX.)

The first sentence, which contains the only explanation in the book of the scar described upon Ahab's first appearance,¹ appears not only mystifying, inadequate, and irrelevant, but even Gothic and ridiculous. There is more than a little melodramatic paraphernalia in *Moby Dick* and the idea of Ahab's practising a Persian cult of fire-worship on a whaling vessel might appear to head the list of such monstrosities. Yet this sentence is not irrelevant; nor is it merely designed to magnify Ahab by mystifying the reader;²

¹ "Threading its way out from among his grey hairs, and continuing right down one side of his tawny scorched face and neck, till it disappeared in his clothing, you saw a slender rod-like mark, lividly whitish. It resembled that perpendicular seam sometimes made in the straight, lofty trunk of a great tree, when the upper lightning tearingly darts down it, and without wrenching a single twig, peels and grooves out the bark from top to bottom ere running off into the soil, leaving the tree still greenly alive, but branded." (Ch. XXVIII.)

² For example, Melville's indebtedness to the style of Sir Thomas Browne, notable in the final paragraphs of chapters I, LVII, LXXXV, XXVIII, CIV, CV,

it is the key which explains many paradoxical and confusing references to fire and enables us to relate the fire symbolism to the final, central meaning of the book.

Hints too numerous to mention throughout the story question the orthodox Christian and Transcendental belief in the essential goodness of the universe and in the idea of progress. The sea symbolizes the evil in man which reflects a corresponding evil in reality.³ It is not surprising that such speculations should take Melville to Zoroastrianism, which divides the universe between Ahmazd, the god of light, who is good, and Ahriman, the god of darkness, who is evil—two equal forces in ceaseless conflict. This conception of reality leads to the introduction of the ambiguous harpooner, Fedallah, who acts as an alter ego of Ahab, his evil self,⁴ as Mephistopheles luring Ahab Faust to sell his soul for aid in his vengeance against the white whale; and, finally, as a Parsee—a Zoroastrian fireworshipper. Clearly the presence of Fedallah the Parsee suggests that Ahab has practiced Zoroastrian rites, assisted by him. Since fire represents Ahmazd, the good, to the Zoroastrians, it is difficult to understand how it can also symbolize evil, as it does constantly,⁵ and finally, in the scene of the corpusants, be virtually identified with the malign element in nature that Ahab is opposing. Nor can this paradox be resolved by blending Fedallah's roles of Parsee and Mephistopheles.⁶ It

etc., is revealed in imaginative flights that would justify such an explanation if no more reasonable one could be found

³ See especially Ch. LVIII.

⁴ See Ch. CXXX, and LXXXIII, CXXXII.

⁵ As in Ch. xcvi, "The Try-Works" "Look not too long in the face of the fire, O Man! Never dream with thy hand on the helm! . . . believe not the artificial fire, when its redness makes all things look ghastly."

⁶ F. O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance* (New York, 1941), p. 441, finds a confusion in the symbols which "involves reversals of values that are not always easy to understand. . . . As an instance of the way he made his shifts, you find him first numbering among the sacred associations of whiteness, 'the white forked flame . . . held the holiest on the altar . . . by the Persian fire worshippers.' Yet when he came to treat the relations between Ahab and Fedallah, he was thinking in terms of a Yankee *Faust*, and the Parsee's power had therefore to be made diabolic. Consequently, fire-worship became a sinister act that had left Ahab scarred for life." I do not think there is any confusion of symbols or reversal of values here, but rather an organic use of them in the dramatic movement of the story, as will be demonstrated.

demands rather an understanding of Ahab's spiritual development through his quest into the nature of things.

Before the opening of *Moby Dick*, Ahab must be assumed to have accepted the Christian belief in the goodness and omnipotence of God. Speculation (or experience—the book moves on both levels) led him to recognize the presence of ubiquitous evil. Still on the side of the good, Ahab ranged himself against evil and even attempted to eradicate it. At this point, when searching out evil, he was smitten, not by evil but by what he had considered the element of good. When Moby Dick severed his leg, when lightning struck him,⁷ when speculation revealed a preponderance of evil in the grand scheme of being—the story presents itself on all these levels of meaning—Ahab turned from a believer in good-menaced-by-evil to the desperate conviction that evil lay at the heart of reality. From a quester he turned to a hater, madly seeking to find and destroy the “unknown but still reasoning thing,” with “outrageous strength” and “inscrutable malice sinewing it” that had injured him.⁸

But Ahab's development does not stop there. The story of *Moby Dick* is not merely the carrying through of this insane purpose to inevitable self-destruction. On another level Ahab continues to speculate and to develop until he comes finally to the higher wisdom of knowing that man's fate must be tragic,⁹ that opposition brings out whatever greatness is his, and that, on the contrary, in a “per-

⁷ Upon Ahab's first appearance, he is described as looking “like a man cut away from the stake, when the fire has overrunningly wasted all the limbs without consuming them. . . .” (Ch xxviii.) This description, which appears purely metaphorical on first reading, must also be taken literally.

⁸ Ch. xxxvi. Also Ch. xli “No turbaned Turk, no hired Venetian or Malay, could have smote him with more seeming malice. Small reason was there to doubt, then, that ever since that almost fatal encounter, Ahab had cherished a wild vindictiveness against the whale, all the more fell for that in his frantic morbidness he at last came to identify with him, not only all his bodily woes, but all his intellectual and spiritual exasperations. The White Whale swam before him as the monomaniac incarnation of all those malicious agencies which some deep men feel eating in them, till they are left living on with half a heart and half a lung.

⁹ This interpretation has been admirably presented by H. A. Myers, “Captain Ahab's Discovery: The Tragic Meaning of *Moby Dick*,” *New England Quarterly*, Spring, 1942,—an article to which I am greatly indebted.

fect" world man would be no different from the animals. Speaking of the pull toward love that Pip exerts on him, Ahab says, "My malady becomes my more desired health." (Ch. CXXXIX.) With this realization the conflict between "good" and "evil" disappears, for these once alien principles are fused in a conception of a Reality that requires and indeed embodies both.¹⁰

The fire symbolism in *Moby Dick* is in complete harmony with these ideas. Ahab first worshipped fire as the destroyer of evil, in the authentic Zoroastrian manner, considering it the principle of light. When doing so he was struck by lightning, fire burned him.¹¹ The burning was the counterpart of his being maimed by Moby Dick, although we must assume that it happened before his fated encounter with the Whale (previously a source of nature's bounty) and that the latter spurred him on from disillusion to indignation and madness. Such an order of events is in keeping with the development of the theme of the book; nor do Ahab's actions after being "dismasted" allow for an interlude of fire-worship. His being burned is the revelation—not yet understood by Ahab—that "evil" and "good" are not separate but One. After this experience Ahab hates the fire as he hates Moby Dick because he considers it essential evil, alien to man and maliciously destructive. As the voyage proceeds and Ahab grows wiser through speculation, he brings his two polar attitudes toward fire together. Addressing the corpusants, he calls fire a "clear spirit" and thus seems to be

¹⁰ Ishmael touches this idea in the Try-Works chapter "The sun hides not the ocean, which is the dark side of this earth, and which is two-thirds of this earth. So, therefore, that mortal man who hath more of joy than sorrow in him, that mortal man cannot be true—not true, or undeveloped." (Ch. XCVI.) Ahab skirts it in his address to the fire of the corpusants and expresses it explicitly in the last chapter, when he is at the point of death "Oh lonely death on lonely life! Oh, now I feel my topmost greatness lies in my topmost grief" See Myers, *op. cit.*

¹¹ In this connection we may note the symbolism of Ahab's words uttered when he is destroying the quadrant: "Cursed be all things that cast man's eyes aloft to that heaven, whose live vividness but scorches him, as these old eyes are even now scorched with thy light, O sun!" (Ch. CXVIII.) It seems probable that Melville intended this fire-worship to have been practiced under the direction of Fedallah, on a previous voyage, but the dramatic requirement of having Ahab smuggle Fedallah aboard, plus the fact of Fedallah's Mephistophelean role and the fact that the mates would have recognized him and thereby lessened his mysteriousness, made it impossible for Melville to be explicit on this point.

calling it good, yet in the same speech he says it is unmoved by love or reverence, that it can only kill, and that it is indifferent to man. Yet he worships it now, even though he proclaims that its "right worship is defiance." This attitude is a great development from his earlier insane hatred of Moby Dick,—a hatred which, curiously enough, must be preserved for the concluding action even though Ahab has in some senses outgrown it

Ahab, in short, realizes that evil (Emerson would say Fate) cannot be destroyed but that man rises to greatness in struggling with it. More strictly, he realizes the necessity of what he has found to be the nature of being, and he also knows that he is a part of this order, with all its qualities. He indicates the fusion of opposites in the One by saying, "Come in thy lowest form of love, and I will kneel and kiss thee, but at thy highest, come as mere supernal power, and though thou launchest navies of full-freighted worlds, there's that in here that still remains indifferent." And in the next sentence he asserts his affinity with this reality by identifying himself with fire. "Oh, thou clear spirit, of thy fire thou madest me, and like a true child of fire, I breathe it back to thee."¹²

It would have been incongruous for Ahab, at the moment of recognition, to have identified himself with the whale, for this conception the fire is a more expressive symbol. Faced, also, with the dramatic requirements of the chase and the rising tempo of the action which permitted less digression and philosophical extension as the climax approached, Melville set up the accompanying fire-symbol as another string to his bow; with it he could foreshadow, even forestate, his conclusions in a different set of terms, in order to prepare his reader for the implications of the climax. Fire as destroyer and purifier, as in the Phoenix myth, was an obvious complementary symbol to the whale.

Although the fire symbolism greatly enriches the texture of *Moby Dick* and particularly adds depth and force to the idea which emerges at the climax, the corpusants scene may seem to raise a formidable

¹² Ch. CXLIX. Not content with this, Melville goes a step further and describes an ultimate power beyond even the fire: "There is some unsuf-fusing thing beyond thee, thou clear spirit, to whom all thy eternity is but time, all thy creativeness mechanical. Through thee, thy flaming self, my scorched eyes do dimly see it. Oh, thou foundling fire, thou hermit im-memorial, thou too hast thy incommunicable riddle, thy unparticipated grief"

question: namely, why, with the wisdom evinced there, did Ahab have to go on to his destruction? Why could he not profit by his tragic insight? How could he ignore his knowledge that good and evil were not separable? The obvious answer—that the tremendous dynamic impetus of the action had to be carried through to its tragic conclusion—merely underlines the question of its probability, even though all aesthetic considerations demand such an outcome. The impetus of the action, however, is such that this scene, occurring some sixty pages from the end, actually participates in the rush toward the climax. It is turning water moving in from the edge of the maelstrom. More important is the fact that Ahab's tragic wisdom cannot fulfill itself merely as wisdom. Conceiving an alien reality in the Fire, Ahab must, like the Phoenix, experience its destruction in order to experience its purification. He attains through action what cannot be merely reasoned; or, if the word "action" has unwholesome connotations, we might say that experience must be concrete or personal to be true experience.¹³ Ahab's glory appears in his tragedy, as he is driven forward by the exasperating knowledge that the inscrutable Other which "heaps" and "tasks" him is indifferent to love and hate alike. Ahab's constant introspection makes him, more than other tragic heroes, a sort of spectator, experiencing catharsis at his own tragedy.

Although the role of fire is thus explained, the role of Fedallah becomes more ambiguous toward the end of the story. On the Faust level he is given an important chapter of prophecies by which

¹³ Melville's recognition that his tragic hero was not caught in the usual net of circumstances from which, after the first fatal step, there was no possible escape, is indicated by his efforts to add another strand to the web of necessity by playing upon the notion that the whole action is *fated*, as in the following passage: "Ahab is for ever Ahab, man. This whole act's immutably decreed. 'Twas rehearsed by thee and me a billion years before this ocean rolled. Fool! I am the Fates' lieutenant, I act under orders. Look thou, underling! that thou obeyest mine—Stand round me, men. Ye see an old man cut down to the stump; leaning on a shivered lance; propped up on a lonely foot. 'Tis Ahab—his body's part; but Ahab's soul's a centipede, that moves upon a hundred legs. I feel strained, half-stranded, as ropes that tow dismasted frigates in a gale, and I may look so. But ere I break, ye'll hear me crack; and till ye hear that, know that Ahab's hawser tows his purpose yet." (Ch. CXXXIV.)

he reassures Ahab in his hellish pursuit.¹⁴ This level underlies the final action and climax. But on the higher level of Ahab's growing insight into reality, Fedallah must be cast off, and he is, his part becomes less significant and Ahab's more imposing. These struggling roles of Fedallah are revealed in the following passage, where the attempt to reconcile them is obviously unsuccessful

And yet, somehow, did Ahab—in his own proper self as daily, hourly, and every instant, commandingly revealed to his subordinates—Ahab seemed an independent lord; the Parsee but his slave. Still again both seemed yoked together, and an unseen tyrant driving them, the lean shade siding the solid rib. For be this Parsee what he may, all rib and keel was solid Ahab. (Ch cxxx)

But perhaps it is not necessary to reconcile them: Fedallah is not a personality, has no revealed consciousness or point of view, he merely serves as part of the stage-setting in the drama of Ahab's quest.

CHARLES CHILD WALCUTT

University of Oklahoma

BEAU TIBBS AND COLONEL SELLERS

Mark Twain's admiration for Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World* and its influence on his work have been noticed by a number of scholars. In a letter to his brother Orion written March 18, 1860, young Clemens characterized the *Citizen of the World* as one of his two "*beau ideals*" of fine writing.¹ His most obvious imitation of Goldsmith appears in two articles published in the *Galaxy Magazine* for October and November of 1870 under the title, "Goldsmith's Friend Again." In them he used Goldsmith's device of letters from a Chinese to a friend in his own country to attack the inhuman treatment frequently accorded Chinese in America. A number of other parallels between passages in the *Citizen of the World* and episodes from Mark Twain's works have been pointed

¹⁴ Ch cxvii. Also Ch cxxx: "Even as Ahab's eyes so awed the crew's, the inscrutable Parsee's glance awed his."

¹ *Mark Twain's Letters*, ed. A. B. Paine (New York and London, 1917), p. 45.

out by Friedrich Schönmann, who also believes that Goldsmith materially influenced Mark Twain's style and contributed significantly to his philosophy of history.²

A further noteworthy similarity in incident and characterization, which has not previously been pointed out, involves two of their most entertaining characters, Goldsmith's Beau Tibbs of the *Citizen of the World* and Mark Twain's Colonel Sellers of *The Gilded Age*. The most striking parallelism in incident occurs in scenes in which each explains away an obviously cheap and unappetizing dinner to which an unexpected guest has come. Tibbs, who has brought the Chinese philosopher home for dinner, asks his wife about the meal in preparation, tentatively suggesting a turbot or an ortolan, but at her pointed suggestion of ox cheek, he takes the cue and exclaims enthusiastically, "The very thing, it will eat best with some smart bottled beer; but be sure to let's have the sauce his grace was so fond of"³ Similarly when Washington Hawkins arrives unexpectedly at the Sellers's home and discovers that the only food for the evening is to be raw turnips, Colonel Sellers launches into praise of the turnip, and, like Tibbs, suggests the condiment which a nobleman of his acquaintance had eaten with them. "Some people like mustard with turnips, but—now there was Baron Poniatowski—lord, but that man did know how to live! true Russian you know, Russian to the backbone; I say to my wife, give me a Russian every time for a table comrade."⁴

Elsewhere the two similarly display their ingenuity in explaining away an embarrassing circumstance. Both speak of the obvious poverty and wretchedness of their living quarters as in reality evidence of good taste. Among the furnishings of the Tibbs's house the Chinese notices several "paltry, unframed pictures." Tibbs immediately asks: "What do you think of that head in a corner, done in the manner of Grisoni? There's the true keeping in it; it's my own face, and though there happens to be no likeness, a countess offered me an hundred for its fellow, I refused her, for, hang it, that would be mechanical, you know."⁵ Similarly Wash-

² Friedrich Schönmann, *Mark Twain als literarische Persönlichkeit* (Jena, 1925), pp. 89-98.

³ *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. Peter Cunningham (New York and London, 1908), iv, 325.

⁴ *The Writings of Mark Twain* (New York and London, 1907-18), x, 127. The two episodes are remarkably alike in detail as well as in spirit.

⁵ *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, iv, 324.

ington notices a dilapidated clock in the Sellers's home "Remarkable clock," said Sellers. . . . "I've been offered—well, I wouldn't expect you to believe what I've been offered for that clock. Old Gov. Hager never sees me but he says, 'Come, now, Colonel, name your price—I *must* have that clock!' But my goodness I'd as soon think of selling my wife."⁶

Both men attempt to create and heighten the impression of their affluence and importance by a constantly urged secrecy. Beau Tibbs has no sooner met the Chinese philosopher than he mentions confidentially a lucrative employment in prospect for himself. "You shall know,—but let it go no further,—a great secret—five hundred a year to begin with."⁷ Similarly, when Colonel Sellers hints to Washington that he is on the verge of great fortune, he enjoins secrecy: "I've got some prodigious operations on foot, but I'm keeping quiet, mum's the word. " And again, "Here's the Rothschilds' proposition—this is between you and me, you understand."⁸

Both lard their conversations with references to their supposed friendships with persons of social or political prominence. Tibbs with his friend Lord Mudler, the Duchess of Piccadilly, Lady Grogram, Lord Trip, and Lord Swamp, and Sellers with Baron Poniatowski, Governors Shackleby and Hager, and Count Fugier.⁹

It would, of course, be wrong to insist that Beau Tibbs was the only, or even the most important model for Colonel Sellers. The type of character represented by the two is common enough in real life, and it seems very probable that Sellers was in large part drawn from the character of James Lampton, a cousin of Mark Twain's.¹⁰ The similarity between Sellers and Dickens's Mr. Micawber has

⁶ *The Writings of Mark Twain*, x, 87-8.

⁷ *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, iv, 317-18.

⁸ *The Writings of Mark Twain*, x, 94, 96.

⁹ *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, iv, 317, 318, 321, 323, *The Writings of Mark Twain*, x, 88, 90, 127, 151.

¹⁰ Albert Bigelow Paine in his *Mark Twain, A Biography* (New York and London, 1912), i, 23, writes: "Mark Twain simply put James Lampton on paper when he created Colonel Sellers." See also his remarks, i, 11-12. See also M. M. Brashear's *Mark Twain, Son of Missouri* (Chapel Hill, 1934), pp. 63-67, 70-71, for mention of a William Muldrow whose career as land speculator was not unlike that of Colonel Sellers. Miss Brashear concludes, however, that Muldrow was not the model for Sellers.

also been pointed out¹¹ In his prevailing cheerfulness and in his constant erection of financial castles in the air Sellers is very much like Macawber, but his constant effort to clothe the drab reality of his poverty and failure is more like that of Beau Tibbs. The best conclusion seems to be that Colonel Sellers was a composite. Mark Twain based his characterization on a living model, James Lampton, but in developing the character he followed suggestions that he had gained, perhaps unconsciously, from Goldsmith and Dickens.

EDWARD H. WEATHERLY

University of Missouri

A NOTE ON THREE LYRICS OF PHILIP FRENEAU

It is at once evident to the reader of "To the Memory of the Brave Americans," "The Indian Burying Ground," and "The Wild Honey Suckle" that the language fits the pattern of the pre-Romantic poets with their *sequestered bowers*, *haughty tyrants*, *rural reigns*, *verdant vales*, and *female fays*. In Freneau's poems one finds, for example, *rural reign*, *tearful tide*, *guardian shade*, and *runder race*. Similarities in phrasing abound in the poems of Thomson, the Wartons, Shenstone, Collins, Gray, and Freneau, and it is an interesting pastime to leaf from poem to poem on the hunt for them.

The rhyme schemes likewise fit the same pattern. That of "The Wild Honey Suckle," *a b a b c c*—though not most popular or typical in the period of transition from classicism to romanticism—appears occasionally from about 1740 on; it is the form of Thomson's "Rule, Britannia!" The *a b a b* form of the other two poems was extremely popular, as evidenced by its use in scores of poems.

Likenesses extend also to the rhymes, with (to name a few) *plain*, *bloom*, *doom*, *morn*, *decline*, *thine*, *lands*, *wave*, *swain*, *vain*, *shade*, *here*, *bower*, *grave*, *rest*, *die*, *fate*, *array*, and *inspire* often appearing. Though some similarity would thus be expected, hardly

¹¹ See Stuart Sherman's comment, *Cambridge History of American Literature* (New York, 1936), III, 14. See also Edward Wagenknecht's *Mark Twain, The Man and His Work* (New Haven, 1935), p. 270 n.

more than a casual investigation of the rhymes of Freneau's best-known lyrics and those of the best-known lyrics of Collins which possess the same or similar rhyme schemes reveals an amazing likeness

Collins's "A Song from Shakespeare's Cymbeline" and "Ode on the Death of Thomson" are made up of four-line stanzas composed of iambic tetrameter lines rhyming *a b a b* and are thus identical in form to Freneau's "The Indian Burying Ground" and "To the Memory of the Brave Americans" The "Ode Written in the Beginning of the Year 1746" and "The Wild Honey Suckle" are alike in being iambic tetrameter and in having six-line stanzas and different only in that the stanzas of the former are made up of three couplets and those of the latter of a quatrain followed by a couplet.

The three poems of Collins contain in all 40 pairs of rhymes, those of Freneau, 48 pairs Of these 40 pairs, 25 pairs or 50 rhymes are matched in the 48 pairs or 96 rhymes of Freneau, of these 50 rhyming lines 18 rhymes are identical,¹ and the remaining 32 are similar.²

In diction the likenesses are less startling, in fact, there is probably as much similarity in the wording of Gray and Freneau or of Shenstone and Freneau as of Collins and Freneau—with one exception. Collins's line "How sleep the brave, who sink to rest"³ appears in Freneau as "Sigh for the shepherds sunk to rest."⁴

H. H. Clark is the only scholar to suggest that Freneau may have been influenced by Collins. He points out that "To the Memory of the Brave Americans" has the form of the "Ode on the Death of Thomson," but has more in general manner of treat-

¹ *Shade, here, rest* (Each appears twice as rhymes in Collins's poems), *dressed, eye, die, tide, doom, say, seen, bloom, plain, dead, there, more.*

² As Collins's *cold*, Freneau's *bold* In addition to similar and identical rhymes, there are eight pairs of rhymes in Collins which may be said to be approximated in Freneau. Examples are Collins, *eyes, lies, retire, spire, hours, flowers*—Freneau, *eye, by, admires, aspires, hour, flower.* If these near rhymes are added to the total of identical or similar rhymes, only seven pairs of rhymes in Collins's three poems are not matched (or approximated) in the three Freneau poems!

³ From "Ode Written in the Beginning of the Year 1746."

⁴ From "To the Memory of the Brave Americans."

ment with the "Ode Written in the Beginning of the Year 1746" He goes on to say "The similarity here is by no means close, it was, I think, rather Collins's mood, his gentle spirit, which may have influenced Freneau in this poem"⁵

The similarities between Freneau and Collins, however, as pointed out in the present study of three poems by each, would seem to indicate that the influence was considerably stronger than has been recognized, and that Collins should be added to the list of English pre-Romantics on whom Freneau modelled his poetry.

V E GIBBENS

Purdue University

THE GENESIS OF MARTIN FABER IN CALEB WILLIAMS

Even the most casual reader must notice striking similarities between Godwin's *Caleb Williams* (1794) and William Gilmore Simms's *Martin Faber* (1833) That the criminal novel of Simms grew out of the work of Godwin seems almost certain from a detailed comparison of the similarities of the two books.

First, *Caleb Williams* reveals in autobiographical form the maniacal tendencies of an abnormal character, *Martin Faber* portrays precisely the same thing Moreover, in order to make their

⁵ "The Literary Influences of [sic] Philip Freneau," *Studies in Philology*, xxii (January, 1925), 133 Clark's remarks are brief, and he considers only the one poem of Freneau He goes to some length, on the other hand, to show the influence of other eighteenth century poets—especially the Wartons and Gray—on Freneau Tyler, Richardson, Wendell, Farrington, and Pattee make no mention of resemblances between the works of Collins and the American poet Walter F Taylor classes Freneau with Gray, Collins, Cowper, and Burns as transition poets between neoclassicism and romanticism (*A History of American Letters*, 62-64) but avoids any commitment as to whether Freneau was influenced by them An anonymous reviewer in the *Port Folio* of October 17, 1807, said of "The Indian Burying Ground" that "the two last stanzas are in the sweetest style of Collins" (page 253), but he drew no inferences concerning influence. Lewis Leary, who writes in the preface to *That Rascal Freneau* (Rutgers College, 1941) that he has "purposely avoided speculation on Freneau's sources or his relation to any literary movement," refers to this comparison of Freneau and Collins for the only reference to Collins in his book

works the more effective, both authors have written their stories in the first person

In the second place, in *Caleb Williams* Falkland confesses his crime to Williams, his close friend.¹ Under the influence of his perverse fate Faber, as Falkland had done, confesses to William Harding, his most intimate friend, that he is a murderer, merely falsifying the details in order to escape detection.²

In the third place, the crimes of both Faber and Falkland are unmasked by their close friends and confidants after long and persistent efforts. It is the long-continued spying and denunciation of his friend and former servant, Caleb Williams, which finally brings about the confession of Falkland.³ Likewise, in *Martin Faber*, it is the ever-present vigilance of Harding, Faber's closest friend, which eventually leads to the unmasking of Faber's crime and to his confession of guilt.⁴

In the fourth place, it is interesting to note that Caleb Williams publicly accuses Falkland of being a murderer, but is not believed,⁵ in the same fashion Harding is not believed when he, because of the promptings of the ghost of the murdered Emily Andrews, denounces Martin Faber as a murderer.⁶

In the fifth place, there is a striking similarity of names in the two works. In *Caleb Williams* Emily Melville dies a lingering death as a result of the cruelties of her cousin, Tyrrel. Emily Andrews, the heroine of *Martin Faber*, is first seduced by Faber and then brutally slain. There is even a similarity in the fates of the two women.

In the sixth place, Caleb Williams loves Falkland and deeply regrets the role he feels compelled to play in the latter's conviction. The long-hounded Caleb has persistently sought to denounce Falkland, believing that such action will bring him peace and satisfaction. At last, however, having made his accusation against the dying Falkland, he is afflicted with undying remorse.⁷ The self-reproach of Harding after Faber's conviction is no less bitter than that of Caleb Williams after Falkland's ruin. The penitent Hard-

¹ William Godwin, *Caleb Williams* (London, 1835), pp. 185-186

² W. G. Summs, *Martin Faber* (New York, 1837), pp. 82-83.

³ *Caleb Williams*, p. 450.

⁴ *Martin Faber*, pp. 106-133

⁵ *Martin Faber*, pp. 90-91

⁶ *Caleb Williams*, pp. 382-383

⁷ *Caleb Williams*, pp. 448-452

ing piteously begs forgiveness of Faber for having brought the latter to the gallows for his heinous crime.⁸

Finally, it must be made clear that there are certain major differences between the two works. *Caleb Wilhams* is a powerful exposé of social injustices and the oppressions practiced by the rich and socially powerful against the poor and socially inferior classes. On the other hand, the author of *Martin Faber* intended to show the ruinous results upon character of improper education, over-indulgence by parents, and poor environmental conditions in general during childhood and early youth.⁹ It is obvious, therefore, that the aims of the two works are different.

The plot of *Caleb Wilhams* is complicated and digressive, that of *Martin Faber* is simple and straightforward. *Caleb Wilhams* employs a large number of characters, *Martin Faber* makes use of comparatively few. However, as a work of art the American novel is decidedly inferior to its English prototype. In style Godwin is polished, elegant, a master of expression; the style of Simms, on the other hand, is inclined to be rougher, more crude, and less effective in general than that of Godwin.

FLOYD H. DEEN

Indiana University

THE DOUBLE OF DOSTOYEVSKY

The Double marks Dostoyevsky's first attempt to delve deeply into the mysteries of human psychology, but, despite the high hopes with which he published the book, it did not prove successful and many years later in the *Journal of a Writer*, November, 1877 (ed. Lazhechnikov, p. 456), he confessed,

This story positively did not succeed, but the idea was quite brilliant, and I never introduced into literature anything more serious than this idea. But the form of this story was absolutely not successful. I corrected it afterwards strongly, fifteen years later, for the then "Complete Collection" of my works, but I was then again convinced, that this thing was completely unsuccessful, and if I should now work on this idea and express it again, I would choose a completely different form, but in '46 I had not found this form and was not master of the story

It is a frank admission of failure, but unfortunately at no time

⁸ *Martin Faber*, pp 134-137

⁹ *Martin Faber*, "Advertisement," p. ix

did Dostoyevsky definitely tell us what idea he was endeavoring to set forth and critics have been no more successful in defining it than in coming to an agreement as to the reality of the second Golyadkin. Many have seen the idea as having some sociological or social content, but it may be merely an attempt to picture objectively the mental disintegration of a man by objectifying his thoughts and aspirations and delusions. The story is almost impossible to visualize and the strange way in which the second Golyadkin appears and disappears will confuse the most careful reader.

Let us look first at a few points in it. At the opening we find Ivan Petrovich Golyadkin in a bad way physically and still more psychically. He has even been to consult a physician, Krestyan Ivanovich, who tells him that he must change his manner of living and not be afraid of society. Apparently in an effort to do this, he hires a carriage to attend the party in honor of Klara Olsufyevna, to which he has not been invited and from which he is turned away for some unexplained reason. After his discomfiture, he wanders around the streets and becomes aware of another man who walks home to his own apartment. He is sure that "his nocturnal visitor was no other than himself—Mr Golyadkin himself, a second Mr. Golyadkin but completely as he, himself—in a word, what is called his double in all relations." (Ed. Lazhechnikov, p. 218 f.)

The next morning this second Golyadkin appears in his office, directly facing him. It arouses no interest among the other officials that there should be two men of the same name in the office. Dostoyevsky implies that the second is a new man (cf. p. 225), but the conversation of Golyadkin and Anton Antonovich does not take the form which we should expect, had the second Golyadkin been an apparition or had the older Golyadkin made a mistake as to the identity or name of the new official.

That same evening Golyadkin invites his new friend home and the stranger tells a story which is almost certainly that of Golyadkin himself, of his unjust treatment in the provinces, of his coming to Petersburg and of his first assignment to duty in the capital. Yet we have no reason to believe that the senior Golyadkin is now weaving a borrowed uniform or is unsure of his position except for his peculiar illness, his fear of unnamed enemies, and his unexplained scandalous conduct with Karolina Ivanovna. As so often

in his early works, Dostoyevsky avoids a consistent picture of the events preceding the story and plunges into the action without making clear at any time what is the genesis of the present situation. We are asked to accept Golyadkin's attitude and to see everything through his eyes, but the author does not explain to us the real situation.

The two Golyadkins spend the night together, but by morning the guest has disappeared without a trace and Petrushka grimly remarks to his master that "the master is not at home" and only later does he grunt out that the other had left an hour and a half before. Later he makes the cryptic remark "Good people live honorably, good people live without falsehood, and are never doubles" (cf. p 282). The servant may be alluding to the double or to the intrigues into which his master pushes so zealously.

After this night, the role of the second Golyadkin changes. He is no longer the friendly suppliant. He is rather the successful careerist accomplishing without an effort all that the older man could not gain by intrigue and double-dealing and at the same time the cynical revealer of all that lurks in the back of the senior's mind. He knows at each moment how to exasperate and annoy the first Golyadkin and how to compel him to display to his associates all of his bad sides. Yet it is interesting and perhaps a consequence of the official's insanity that he never notices his rival talking with the other men in the office and the second Golyadkin only appears when he can annoy his rival.

This leads the first Golyadkin to the interchange of letters, but these are never delivered and we are left in the dark as to whether they really exist and whether Petrushka is actually sent to deliver them, or tries to do so.

The confusion continues until Golyadkin is retired and again we are not sure whether this retirement is because of insanity or because of the scandal with Karolina Ivanovna. Then comes the fatal letter from Klara with whom Golyadkin imagines himself in love and by whose father he has apparently been greatly helped. Bem considers this like the others imaginary. Osipov (Dvoynik, "Peterburgskaya Poema," in A. L. Bem, *O Dostoyevskom*, I, 44), believes that it may be a practical joke on the part of some rough practical jokers. This is hardly probable for it would introduce a completely extraneous note into the story.

Golyadkin has already had his dream of achieving success and then being confused by his rival who possesses those qualities that he himself is desirous of acquiring. In a sense Golyadkin feels toward the double as Salieri does to Mozart in the little drama of Pushkin, *Mozart and Salieri*. It is a recognition that his own ideals are better than his reality, an unconscious tribute to those sides of his character which he refuses to recognize.

It precipitates however the final tragedy. Golyadkin visits his Excellency and then through a doorway which he took for a mirror appears the second Golyadkin and dominates him exactly as he had dreamed. From there he dashes to the house of Olsufy Ivanovich, and again finds there Andrey Semenovitch and the second Golyadkin, whom for a moment he pardons. But then Krestyan Ivanovich appears and takes him off to the insane asylum, while the face of the double long remains behind him in the carriage, until he drops into forgetfulness.

All this makes the second Golyadkin a strange figure. He is treated as definitely real and yet there is no proof that he has a real existence outside of the ideas of the first Golyadkin. He is and he is not almost at one and the same moment. The two Golyadkins really represent the two sides of the character of the first man, the mean and sordid and intriguing official and the collection of memories of the past and hopes for the future that throng around his unhappy head.

It was a startling device that the young author assayed, but it is no more fantastic, even if less palpable, than the assumption of magic caps which render the wearer invisible as in Pushkin's *Ruslan and Lyudmila*, or of the paraphernalia in any tale of magic and of the supernatural. Yet it cannot be convincing. The human intellect is not prepared to see people separate into two beings and move in the same environment. Dostoyevsky never tried it again. Hereafter to express his doubles, he employed devices as in the *Raw Youth*, where Versilov changes from one side of his nature to the other behind the scenes, or in the *Brothers Karamazov*, where the devil appears to Ivan when he is alone and mocks him by throwing at him his own words. Or, as in the *Land lady*, he presents his hero as in a state of delirium where anything is possible.

The goal of Dostoyevsky in this novel is really intelligible. It is to present in objective form the lucid and illucid reactions of an

insane man in his social and business life. It is to express in objective form the actions and the aspirations of a man in conflict with himself. Yet the device chosen is unsuccessful. The human mind cannot visualize this kind of existence. We demand that the second Golyadkin be a real person or an apparition. He is neither and both at the same time. It is idle to discuss whether the letters are real or imaginary. It is idle to discuss whether there are two or one man in the apartment and in the office. We can only read the story and accept the reality as Golyadkin accepted it without asking questions or seeking for definite answers to the question.

We have a real picture of a paranoiac with his delusions and his moments of lucidity. We have one man and two and if we can accept the stories of magic that have existed since the earliest ages of man, we must read this with the same confidence in the integrity and intentions of the author. Our minds refuse to do this. Dostoyevsky himself realized this after the novel was published. He admitted his failure and he went on to find other devices for thus revealing the deepest sides of human psychology, but he did not try again to present them simultaneously to the public in two different but similar bodies. *The Double* is a milestone on the way to his greater works, but it represents a false step which has remained to produce discussion and baffle the reader and the scholar.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

EINZEL = EINZAL

Under *einzel* Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (III, 349) has the following entry:

EINZEL, singulus, ein wort, dessen geschichte noch nicht genug aufgehell't ist und das sich mehrfach veränderte. ahd. begegnet es gar nicht, eben so wenig alts. und ags., den begriff drückt die ahd. zusammensetzung *einluzi* (sp. 229) aus, goth. erscheint das unzusammengesetzte *annakls*, nnl. *enkel* (sp. 214 *enkel*), neben welchem nd. *entel* auftritt (gramm. 3, 770). *k* und *t* tauschen sonst in deutschen dialecten nicht, und jenem *ainakl* ein alts. *êntal*, ahd. *einazal* an die seite zu setzen bleibt gewagt; vielleicht gewährte dem *einazal* das adv. *einazê*m (gramm. 3, 11) stütze und für das nhd. *ein* wäre ahd. *einazi* möglich. der sinn von unicuius ruht an den von singulus.

auch mhd. herrscht *einlutze* vor, *einzel* taucht selten, aber sicher in zwei stellen auf:

der richtet einzele schaden *Trist* 9, 5,
mit einzelnen brenden. 488, 12,

9, 5 gibt eine hs. *enzele*, wie gleichfalls im *passional* und bei *Jeroschin* verdünnt wird, belege folgen unter *einzel* man erwäge auch das adv. *einzeligen*

nhd. *einzel* mangelt in den ältesten wörterbüchern, *Dasypodius* hat für singulus *ietlichs besunder*, *Frisius* *ieder besunder, einer allein*, auch bei *Henisch* kein *einzel*, das bei *Stieler* zuerst verzeichnet ist, es war durch *Luthers* bibel längst befestigt, dessen frühere schriften noch oft verengtes *enzel* setzten also *dienete Jacob umb Rahel sieben jar und dauchten in als werens einzele tage, so lieb hatte er sie*. 1. Mos. 29, 20; es sol kein einzeler zeuge wider jemand auftreten. 5 Mos. 19, 15. . . .

Later authors add but little to Grimm's statement. Marold's edition of Gottfried's *Tristan* gives further variants in the two verses cited above *zemzen* and *etzelichen* (v. 283 in Marold), and *etelen, einzegen* (v. 19450). Evidently the scribes in question were either ignorant of the word *einzel*, or else they disapproved of it.

As to the derivation of *einzel*, we saw above that Grimm considered the possible existence of an OHG. **einzel*, but decided that this etymology is "gewagt." It was tentatively put forward as early as 1691 by Stieler, the first lexicographer to record the word (col. 369):

Einzel, adj. & adv. ab *Ein* & *Zal* fortè compositum, *singulus, particularis, singularis*: & *individuum*. Ein einzeler Mensch, *homo unicus, vir privatus*: adv. *singulatum, particulatum*.

Similarly Adelung, 1774 (I, 1624): "Eher konnte man noch glauben, daß *zel* aus *Zahl* zusammen gezogen sey."

This etymology, tentatively advanced because of lack of a more plausible one, is now supported by a number of actual instances in the spelling *einzel*. The work in question is the Josephus translation of Caspar Hedio¹ (1494-1552), whose biography is given in

¹ *Josephi des hochberümpften vnd vast nutzlichen Historici. Zwentzig bücher von den alten geschichten nach den alten Exemplarn fleissig corrigiert vnd gebessert. Siben bücher von dem Jüdischen krieg vund der zerstörung Hierusalem. . Straßburg. M.D. XXXV im Mayen* 14 unnumbered leaves, 329 numbered leaves, 1 blank, 18 unnumbered leaves with *Register*. With signature pp. a new foliation begins. *Flamij Josephi vom Krieg der*

the *Allg deutsche Biographie* (XI, 223), without mention, however, of the Josephus translation. It may be pointed out that Hedio, like Gottfried, from whose *Tristan* the earliest instances of *einzel* are cited, was a resident of Straßburg.

The following passages are all from the second part, entitled *Krieg der Juden*.

Dann die geste sy erbetten hetten, warden als einzal vmbbracht So sy wider hinweg gon wolten, dann das geschutz trieb steyn biß in Tempel vnd zû den altarn, daruon die priester vnd die, die gotlich ampt volbrachten todt fielen, vnd seind der vil die die von den weitgelengsten enden der welt zû der heiligen statt waren, vor den opffern todt bliben (*Krieg der Juden* 99^a), So sy dann weiter dann ein armbrust schuß hindersich wichen, kundten sy den sturm mitt den Bocken nit woren, die on vnderlaß stutzten, vnd als einzal etwas schüffen (107^a).

These two instances are of particular importance, since the noun value of *einzal* (i. e. *Einzahl*) is clearly to be recognized. Hedio's translation is at times very free, in the first passage the Latin² (v. l. 3) version, for: *warden als einzal vmbbracht*, has *consumpti tamen erant obiter*, so that *als einzal* translates *obiter*, which may mean 'zufällig,' 'im Vorbeigehen,' 'gelegentlich,' 'dabei,' 'zu gleicher Zeit,' 'sofort.' In the second passage the Latin has: "qui sine intermissione ferientes paulatim aliquid proficiebant," so that *als einzal* is the equivalent of *paulatim*. This word is defined as 'allmählich,' 'stückweise,' 'einzeln,' the last being exactly the present-day meaning of *als einzal*.

Juden vnd der Zerstorung Hierusalem Siben Bücher . . M. D. XXXV Ten unnumbered leaves, followed by leaf 331 (instead of 1), 2-176, plus *Register* of 8 unnumbered leaves, in folio. Copy in Princeton University Library.

With this was compared the edition of 1544 in my possession *Joseph des hochberumpten vnd fast nutzlichen histori beschreibers Zweyntzig bucher von den alien geschichten . . Straßburg M. D. XLIIII*. Fourteen unnumbered leaves, 344 numbered leaves, 20 unnumbered leaves, with *Register*. With signature rr a new foliation begins *Flaur, Joseph vom krieg der Juden/ vnd der Zerstorung Hierusalem . . M. D. XLIIII*. Twelve unnumbered leaves, 183 numbered leaves, 9 unnumbered leaves, in folio. The passages quoted are given according to the foliation and spelling of the edition of 1535.

² He presumably used the Latin version as a basis, even though he declares on the title-page: "nach den Griechischen Exemplaren restituirt vnd gebessert."

In the next group of examples *ein zal*, *entzal* (without the *als*) is used adverbially

Erstmalß sind sie der sachen mit eins gewesen, nachdem sie ein zal vnd nit mit dē hauffen, nit on forcht nach gewonheit der Juden harauß lieffen (116^a) = Nam primum ne concordare quidem videbatur eorum consilium, paulatim, et per intervalla, et cunctanter, non sine metu exsiliuntium (vi. l. 3) here again *ein zal* renders *paulatim*, dann sy mochten die vorwerck nicht sammentlich, sunder müsten sie entzal brennen (122^a) = nam per partes, non simul omnes porticus incendere valuerunt (vi. 4 2): here *entzal* is the equivalent of *per partes*. in ein yeder wirdschafft nit minder dann zehen menschen das Osterlamb zū essen pflegten, dann allein oder ein zal gezimpt es sich nit (127^b) = solum enim epulari non licet (vi. 9. 3).

Not much stress is to be laid on the spellings *ein zal* and *entzal* in these three passages. the 1544 edition each time has *einzal* (fol 119^b, 126^a, 131^b).

In the next group of examples, *einzal* is used as an attributive adjective, with the meaning 'single,' 'individual', it is not necessary to quote the Latin equivalent:

vñnd also aneinander gefüget, das ein yeder thurn fur einen einzaln stein anzusehen was (103^b), ee dann einer ein einzal brot vnd handuol mals hat offenbaren wollen (111^b); schleiffen yn durch die statt als ob sy sich durch ein einzaln menschen an allen Romern mochten rechnen (125^b), verboten was, dz man kein einzaln solt auffnehmen, damitt sy also yr haußgsund mit brachten, yedoch seind die einzaln auch angenommen (126^b); ein grosse menge volcks der yeder ettwas einzals trüg (131^b); waren mancherley vnd fast kostlich, het seulen von einzaln steinen (135^a); es weinet die gantze statt vnd klaget, vmb eins eintzel mans willen (133^a); haben sich die letsten auch in todt geben, der eintzel vnd letste da er uber sahe die menge (137^b).

These last two passages are the only ones with the spelling *einzel*: the one on f. 133 reads in the edition of 1544: *eyns eynzalen mans*, and that on f. 137 reads: *der eyntzal vnd letst*. In the following passage, as it stands, *einzaln* looks like an adverb, but it may be a misprint:

vorwerck von seulen fünf vñnd zwentzig elen hoch, von einzaln weissem marmelstein, vñnd daruff balcken von Cedryn holtz (104^a).

Both editions agree here.

Finally the adverb *enzalich* is to be mentioned, which is not recorded in the *DWb*, whereas Lexer cites two instances of *enzelliche*

Es fiengen aber erstlich an die emwoner enzolich zûrauben, darnach mit rotten durch das land zûstreyffen (83^b): the 1544 edition has *enzalich*.

For the sake of completeness it may be added that *einzeln*, the adjective and adverb with final *-n*, is as old as Luther, who uses both *einzel* and *einzeln*. Approximately up to the middle of the eighteenth century *einzel* predominates, afterwards the form with *-n* gains the upper hand. In the nineteenth century only Ruckert makes consistent use of the form *einzel*: see *DWb* III, 349, 350.

W. KURBELMEYER

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PHILIPPE DE THAUN'S *BESTIAIRE*

The *Bestiaire* of the Anglo-Norman Philippe de Thaun¹ is not only the oldest known bestiary in any vernacular tongue but one of the oldest literary monuments in the Anglo-Norman dialect. It is dedicated to Queen Aélis of Louvain, the second wife of Henry I. Since this marriage took place in 1121, this furnishes a convenient *terminus post quem* for the composition of the work.²

The *Bestiaire* was not Philippe's first book. It is preceded by the *Comput*, which was probably written in 1119.³ This means that the poet's connection with the court of Henry I antedates the latter's marriage with the Belgian princess, and his true patron seems to have been the king rather than the queen. In fact, if the *Bestiaire* is dedicated to the queen, it is rather to be supposed that the author followed an intimation of his royal master who thus wished to please his young wife. At all events, Thomas Wright probably hit the mark in his shrewd conjecture that the *Bestiaire* was written within the few years that followed the marriage.⁴

¹ *Le Bestiaire de Philippe de Thaun*, éd. E. Walberg, Lund-Paris [1900].

² *Ibid.*, p. xviii

³ *In Cumpoz Philape de Thaun*, ed. E. Mall, Strassburg, 1873, pp. 24 f.

⁴ Th. Wright, *Popular Treatises on Science written during the Middle Ages*, London, 1841, p. x.

If such is the case, it is likely that, in spite of the dedication to the queen, the book was written primarily for the king, probably at his request or expressed desire, and thus we are led to ask What interest could Henry I have had in the French translation of the *Physiologus*? For it will hardly do to explain it by the alleged usefulness of works of this type.⁵

It does not appear to have been pointed out so far that this particular branch of study—zoology, wild life, met with considerable interest on the part of the third monarch of the Norman dynasty in England—Henry I, as is well known and sufficiently indicated by the name *Beauclerc* bestowed upon him, was a man of some literary attainments and far in advance of his royal contemporaries, but what distinguished him particularly from the men of his age was his interest in animals and wild life, an interest which far transcended his passion for the chase, great though that was. Let us listen to the words of William of Malmesbury.⁶

Paul, earl of Orkney, though subject by hereditary right to the king of Norway, was so anxious to obtain the king's friendship, that he was perpetually sending him presents, for he was extremely fond of the wonders of distant countries, begging with great delight . . . from foreign kings, lions, leopards, lynxes, or camels,—animals which England does not produce. He had a park called Woodstock, in which he used to foster his favorites of this kind. He had placed there also a creature called a porcupine, sent to him by William of Montpellier.

William's statement is confirmed by two references to the same deer-park in the works of Henry of Huntington.⁷

Inde ixit rex ad Wodestoke, ad locum insignem, ubi rex cohabitationem hominum et ferarum fecerat

⁵ Gaston Paris, *Mélanges de littérature française du moyen âge*, Paris, 1912, p. 84.

⁶ Willelmi Malmesburiensis monachi *de gestis regum Anglorum*, v, § 409, ed. W. Stubbs, II, p. 485. Paulus Orcadam comes quamvis Noricorum regi hereditario iure subjectus, ita regis amicitias suspiciebat ut crebra ei munuscula missitaret. nam et ille prona voluptate exterarum terrarum miracula inhabat, leones, leopardos, lynces, camelos, quorum foetus Anglia est inops, grandi, ut dixi, jocunditate a regibus alienis expostulans habebatque conseptum quod Wudestoche dicitur, in quo delicias talium rerum confovebat. Posueratque ibi animal quod hystrix vocatur, missum sibi a Willelmo de Monte Pislerio . . .

⁷ *Hist.* (Rolls Series), p. 244: *Epistola de contemptu mundi* (*ibid.*, p. 300).

Post paucos exhinc dies, apud Wodestoke, ubi rex conventum hominum et ferarum statuerat, cum episcopus loqueretur cum rege et episcopo Salesburiensi, qui summi erant in regno, percussus est apoplexia

All this would seem to show that Philippe de Thaun enjoyed the patronage of Henry I, the naturalist, and that it was with this hobby of his master in view, if not at the latter's express orders, that he composed his *Bestiaire*, which he dedicated to Henry's young queen. How far the strange lore of the *Bestiaire* found credence with Henry, we have no means of knowing. Quite possibly the king was sceptical about the statements he found there, and quite possibly, too, like many moderns, he consoled himself with the thought that the *Physiologus* represented the best and most authoritative that could be had at the time.

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

Princeton, N J

AN EARLIER TALBOT EPITAPH

Dr. C. F. Tucker Brooke in his edition of *1 Henry VI* (1918) finds evidence as to the date of Shakespeare's revision of the play in the appearance of the Talbot epitaph in iv, vii, 63-71, which closely resembles the list of Talbot's titles printed in Richard Crompton's *Mansion of Magnanimitie* (1599). It was believed that this is the earliest printed source for the epitaph. Dr. Brooke comments on the interest attached to these titles and observes that "unless some earlier printed source than is now known can be found for Talbot's epitaph, it will be hard to establish a date prior to 1599 for the revised play."

An earlier printed source for the epitaph is, however, to be found in the dedication of a poem written by one Roger Cotton, a London draper, and printed at London in 1596. This work is described by the Rev. Thomas Corser in *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica* as follows: "Cotton, (Roger.)—An Armor of Prooffe, brought from the Tower of David, to fight against Spannyardes, and all enimies of the trueth. By R. C. Imprinted at London by G. Simson and W. White. 1596. 4to, pp. 32." The poem is dedicated to Gilbert Talbot, seventh Earl of Shrewsbury, in allusion to whose noble family the author thus remarks:

Yet in so much as the fame of one of your owne most noble progenatours soundeth in our eares to this day, I trust it shall of none be thought amisse, yf I lay him before your Honourable eyes, as an other example That noble Earle *Iohn Talbot* is the man who either liued as languishing in idlenes, riot or excesse; nor died as hauing surfited with vaine pleasures, and fonde delyghtes but of manly woundes receiued in open feelde, after he had valiantly warred foure & twentie yeeres in defence of his Princes right a death and life most honourable to them that are truly noble and valiant Euen so this worthy peere, togeather with his valiant Sonne the Lord Lisle, in that sore battle fought at *Castillon* in *Fraunce*, their sweete lyues did ende where a monument of the Earle remayneth vnto this day, and this inscription folowing ingrauen thervpon

Heere lyeth the right noble Knight Iohn Talbot Earle of Shrewsburie, Earle of Washford, Waterford, and Valence, Lorde Talbot of Goodricke and Urchingfeilde, Lord Strange of Blackmeare, Lord Verdon of Alton Lord Crumwell of Wingfeilde, Lord Louetoft of Worsoppe, Lord Furnuall of Sheffelde, and Lord Falconbridge, Knight of the most noble orders of S George, S Michael, and the Golden Fleece, Great Marshall to King Henrie the seet of his Realme of Fraunce, who dyed at the battle of Castillon neare Burdeaux, Anno 1453

I find no entry of *An Armor of Proofo* in the *Transcripts of the Stationers Register*, neither against the names of Gabriel Simson and William White, the printers of the 1596 volume, nor against the name of any other printer during the years 1589-1596. However, the *Short Title Catalogue* of Pollard and Redgrave records three copies of the book, and lists the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the Huntington, as the libraries where these copies are to be found. Moreover, in *The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature* by W. T. Lowndes (new ed., 6 vols., London, 1864), there is a description of the 1596 edition which gives the following collation:

A, four leaves, being the title and dedication "To the Christian Reader," 1 leaf, followed by the Poem on B and C, four leaves each, and D 3 leaves.

The collation of the copy owned by the Huntington Library is as follows:

A⁴, ff², B-D⁴, D⁴ wanting, probably blank There are three blank pages in front, and then the title page. The dedication to Talbot begins on sig A₂ recto The letter to the Christian Reader is on ff₁ recto, there is a printer's device at the bottom of the page. ff₂ is a blank leaf. The poem begins on B₁ recto, and ends on the verso side of D₃.

The collation indicates that this 1596 volume is a first edition

Neither the dedication nor the letter to the Christian Reader is signed, and there is no indication of the date of either. However, the autobiographical material contained in the dedication would show it to have been written by the poet, and this no earlier than 1592, since there is in it a reference to Gilbert Talbot as "Knight of the most noble order of the Garter," and Gilbert Talbot was elected K. G. on June 20, 1592.

It is now certain that the Talbot epitaph was in printed form in England in 1596, and that the reviser of *1 Henry VI* could have availed himself of this material then.

The question as to whether or not the Talbot epitaph made its first appearance in England in Cotton's dedication rests on the source from which the poet derived his information. In the dedication Cotton states that the titles are to be found on Talbot's monument at Castilion, near Bordeaux. Crompton makes no mention of a Talbot monument, while Malone volunteers that "this long list of titles is taken from the epitaph formerly fixed on Lord Talbot's tomb in Rouen in Normandy." By reason of negative evidence that Cotton had not been to France, nor had seen a Talbot monument at Castilion, and the fact that Malone does not indicate such a monument at Castilion it may be inferred that Cotton's source for these titles was in England; and further, that the nature of the epitaph would suggest that the source was printed.

Moreover, granting the plausible assumption that Cotton's source was in England, before 1596 at least, and that it was printed, it is not necessary to believe that Cotton's dedication was the specific source employed by the reviser of our play. There is no good reason to doubt that a source available to Roger Cotton would also be available to the reviser, indeed, perhaps even the original author, of *1 Henry VI*.

JOSEPHINE A. PEARCE

University of North Carolina

PARNELL'S "HYMN TO CONTENTMENT"

Parnell's "Hymn to Contentment" is a pleasing but confused poem, the confusion arising from the placing of the center of interest outside the professed subject. The theme suggested by the title and taken up in the opening lines is: Where is Contentment

to be found? How is it to be achieved? The answer given in the second and fourth paragraphs (lines 11-32, 41-8) is, in the main, obvious and conventional not in ambition, avarice, or adventure but in self-discipline and religion. But it is not for the praise of "lovely, lasting Peace of Mind" or for the failure of ambition, avarice, or adventure to supply it that the poem is remembered. The summary given above omits the longest part of the answer to the question, Where is content to be found? The grief-stricken heart, the poet tells us, turns to nature for consolation and peace, but in vain. Here for the first time the poem comes alive. The preceding lines have been pleasantly flowing but nature is spoken of with real delight

The silent Heart which Grief assails,
Treads soft and lonesome o'er the Vales,
Sees Daisies open, Rivers run,
And seeks (as I have vainly done)
Amusing Thought, but learns to know
That Solitude's the Nurse of Woe

Note that Parnell interrupts his description to mention his personal experience in seeking consolation from valleys and still waters. It is likely that he is here referring to his heavy grief at the loss of his wife, who had died two or three years before the poem was published, and to his unsuccessful effort to find in nature consolation for his grief. It is clear from the latter half of the "Hymn" that he ultimately found not only comfort but delight in the physical world; and it seems probable that the "Hymn" is an attempt, as much of Wordsworth's poetry was to be, to find rational justification for this delight

Shaftesbury's deistic conception of communion with nature would not have satisfied Parnell had he known it; he wanted something more orthodox. Furthermore, the deists' ideas did not tally with his own experience. Nature alone, he had found, was not enough, but when one has subjected one's will to the divine will (41-8) renouncing ambition, avarice, adventure, and the merely sensuous enjoyment of the external world (11-32), when one is "Pleas'd and bless'd with God alone" (56), then one finds Peace of Mind, yes even rapture in nature.

The penultimate paragraph expresses a further idea, which may well have been suggested by the noble ode, "The spacious firmament

on high," that Addison published two years before the appearance of this piece. Lovers of nature, Parnell implies, are right in declaring that the heavens, seas,¹ woods, and fields declare the glory of God. Yet "they speak their Maker [only] as they can", to make their message clear they "want and ask the Tongue of Man". Thus this paragraph tells what man can do for nature, just as the preceding one had told what nature may do for man. Both paragraphs deal with man's obligation, which is also his delight, to sing the "great *Source of Nature*".

It will be seen, then, that Parnell's pleasing octosyllabics have little to say about contentment. Their real subject and the source of their inspiration is a stronger feeling: the joy that may be found in nature when one has subjected one's will to God.²

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEATS'S "TO THE NILE"

In his sonnet "To the Nile," written at Hunt's home in competition with Shelley and Hunt on February 4, 1818, Keats addressed the river.

Art thou so fruitful? or dost thou beguile
Such men to honour thee, who, worn with toil,
Rest for a space 'twixt Cairo and Decan?

The lines are puzzling at first, because "toil" and "rest for a space" evoke a picture of an overland journey between Cairo and India, and on such an unheard-of journey the traveler would not encounter the Nile. Nor would he on the usual sea route from Suez. For part of the year, however, when bad weather closed the gulf of

¹ Any expression of appreciation of the beauty of the ocean, such as is implied in line 67, is most unusual at this time.

² The last paragraph, of four lines, corresponds to and is in part a repetition of an earlier paragraph of the same length, lines 33-6. The first two lines of the final paragraph summarize lines 11-32, the last two summarize 33-48, except that here, as in the immediately preceding paragraphs, it is "Bliss" not Contentment that is achieved. Yet "Extreams" in the third line from the end is presumably contrasted with the golden mean of content. I understand the last line to mean, "Or confess that, in the life of bliss which religion enables one to find in nature, the joys of the next world are anticipated."

Suez, the port for the orient was Kosseir on the Red Sea coast. From Kosseir habitable upper Egypt was reached by a desert march of about five days to Kena, 120 miles distant on the Nile. The sonnet can refer only to crossing the desert from Kosseir to the Nile at Kena, when the travelers would be toil-worn and, straight from the desert, readily beguiled into exaggerating the river's fruitfulness.

Just such a situation as the verses require is described by Claude Etienne Savary

M Chevalier, commandant général des établissemens françois dans le Bengale, vient d'arriver au grand Caire par la voie de Cosseir Son vaisseau ayant été frappe de la foudre sur la côte de Malabar, & demâté ensuite à la hauteur de Gedda, il fut forcé de relâcher dans ce port Ces accidents lui avoient fait perdre la saison propre pour gagner le Suès . . . Après avoir lutté pendant trois mois contre les vents contraires, & manqué vingt fois d'être submergé, il atteignit Cosseir Il en partit quelques jours après avec six Européens montés sur des chameaux [They suffered from the heat of the desert, thirst, hunger, and repeated attacks by Bedoun] Enfin, après quatre jours et demi de marche, ils arriverent à Gréné [Kena], brûlés par le soleil, dévorés de soif, mourans de faim & de lassitude Lorsqu'ils se furent baignés dans les eaux du Nil, rassasiés des fruits excellens qui croissent sur ses bords, nourris des productions de la terre féconde qu'il arrose, ils éprouverent un bien-être, un contentement, une joie dont le voyageur qui a traversé les déserts peut seul goûter les délices inexprimables¹

Excepting the substitution of the Deccan for Bengal (which might be due either to the demands of rhyme or to the channel through which Keats learned the tale), the details and thought of the verses correspond to Savary's story of M Chevalier's experience. Although many Europeans must have followed the route at times, the only other record known to me of an arrival at the Nile from India is Sir Robert Wilson's *History of the British Expedition to Egypt* in 1801, which does not suggest the sonnet There is no evidence that Keats read Savary's book (which had been translated into English) but, as Shelley must have drawn upon it for his "Ozymandias," published shortly before in Hunt's *Examiner*,² it seems plausible that Keats heard the story from Shelley.

D. W THOMPSON

Carlisle, Pennsylvania

¹ *Lettres sur l'Egypte*, Paris, 1786, II, 109-112.

² "Ozymandias," *PQ*, Jan, 1937.

A FOOTNOTE TO *THE ROAD TO XANADU*

In considering the influence of the ballads upon *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, Professor Lowes has discussed the tinge of archaism imparted to the diction of the poem. Coleridge's use of "withouten" is especially noted with its probable derivation from a line in *Chevy Chase* as the poet knew it in Percy's *Reliques*.¹

Even stronger evidence that Coleridge's mind was recollecting the rhythms and word patterns of *Chevy Chase* is suggested by a comparison of the following lines:

O Christ! my verry hart doth bleed
 With sorrow for thy sake,
 For sure, a more renowned knight
Chevy Chase, 165-7

The very deeps did rot O Christ!
 That ever this should be!
 Yea, slumy things did crawl with legs .
Ancient Mariner, 119-21.²

The occurrence of "O Christ!", the use of "very" with the intensive meaning, and the employment of the emphatic forms of "do," are common to both first lines. In each case the second line is of subordinate import and the third line begins with a parallel exclamatory affirmative in an opening spondee.

The stanza in *Chevy Chase* describing the battlefield after the slaughter is as follows

O Christ! it was a griefe to see,
 And likewise for to heare,
 The cries of men lying in their gore,
 And scattered here and there (129-32)

When the *Ancient Mariner* describes the appearance of the deck of his ship with the four times fifty men lying where they had fallen, a comparable scene in *Chevy Chase* seems to have occurred to Coleridge, for he wrote.

O Christ! what saw I there?
 Each corse lay flat, lifeless and flat. (514-15)

¹ *The Road to Xanadu*, revised edition, 1930, p. 332.

² References are to the 1798 version.

The exclamation "O Christ!" is a very uncommon one in Percy's *Reliques*, being found only in these two passages. It is likewise rare in Coleridge, and two of its three occurrences in his poems are these in the *Ancient Mariner*:

These parallels, supporting an almost exact duplication of the ballad's metrical form here, suggest still more emphatically that, occasionally at any rate, Coleridge's phrasing and rhythm in this poem were being directed by those of the old ballad of Chevy Chase.

FREDERICK F. SEELY

Allegheny College

TOURIST

According to the *NED* the word *tourist* first appeared "c 1800". But twenty years earlier (1780) an anonymous versifier (probably William Cockin) had written in the "Advertisement" to his *Ode to the Genius of the Lakes in the North of England*.

How the following Ode came to be written it is not here needful to say. But being written, and the author concurring in opinion with some of his friends, that it might yield an innocent amusement to the votaries of a fashionable and innocent object, he consented to have it published. Moved simply by this hope, he throws the piece only into the way of actual tourists.

The two last words were what chiefly impressed a contemporary reviewer:¹

The author of this Ode informs us that he disclaims the idea of offering it to the public as a literary production, and throws the piece only into the way of *actual tourists*. The word *tourist* is, we believe, not to be met with in Johnson's, or any other English Dictionary, though the meaning of it is sufficiently obvious, but as we are not *actual tourists*, unless wandering through the regions of literature may entitle us to that distinction, it cannot be expected that we should receive much entertainment from this poem.

That the *Ode to the Genius of the Lakes* not only planted the word in the language but was also instrumental in fixing it there

¹ *Critical Review*, LII (1781), 234.

is suggested by the fact that in March 1804 the *European Magazine*² plagiarized one of Cockin's longer notes and entitled it "A Hint to the Tourists of the Lakes of Westmorland."

ROBERT A. AUBIN

New Jersey College for Women

AN EARLY QUOTATION FROM SHELLEY

In *The Republican*¹ for 7 April, 1820, there occurs a long quotation from Shelley's *Queen Mab* which Mr. Newman I White does not list in *The Unextinguished Hearth*. The quotation is to be found in an article by Richard Carlile on the trial of Henry Hunt and others² for conspiracy. It is introduced without any mention of its identity. Carlile simply says "I subjoin an extract from a poem which is strongly illustrative and applicable to all national religions." He then quotes *Queen Mab*, iv, 168-221. This quotation ante-dates the *Queen Mab* piracy of 1821, and is, so far as I know, the only extended quotation from the poem to appear between 1815 and 1821.

FRANCIS J. GLASHEEN

Danbury State Teachers College

THE AMERICAN LANGUAGE

Sir Herbert Croft, author of the Young Biography in Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, seems to have been one of the first English writers to acknowledge the existence of an American language. In *A Letter to the Princess Royal of England, on the English and German Languages* (Hamburg, 1797) he refers to his projected English dictionary as "my English and American dictionary" (p.

² xlv, 189-190

¹ Vol II, no 12, London, printed and published by J. Carlile

² "Observations on the trial of Mr. Hunt and Others at York, on a Charge of Conspiracy—Strictures on the Evidence—Speeches of Messrs. Hunt and Scarlett, and Reflections on the Verdict"

3.) The *DAE* records "American dialect" (1740) and "American tongue" (Webster—1789), but Croft's usage is more pregnant, since he gives American the same rank as English.

NOTE. "In American Language" (1802) seems to mean "in plain Speech" (cf German "deutsch und deutlich"), leaving the earliest instance of "the American language" in the *DAE* that of 1815, *ibid.*, I, 41.

STUART ATKINS

Harvard University

+

REVIEWS

The Works of Edmund Spenser. A Variorum Edition. The Minor Poems, Volume One Shepherdes Calender, Daphnada, Colyn Clouts Come Home Againe, Astrophel, Doleful Lay of Clorinda, Fowre Hymnes, edited by CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD and HENRY GIBBONS LOTSPEICH assisted by DOROTHY E. MASON. Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. xii, 734. \$7.50.

The grievous losses which the editorial staff of this work has suffered make the appearance of this latest volume especially noteworthy. Students of Spenser owe Professor Osgood a great debt of gratitude and admiration for the courage and perseverance with which he has carried on this work. And we are glad to see on the title page the name of Miss Dorothy E. Mason who has long worked behind the scenes on this edition.

The format and general character of the Spenser *Variorum* are well established and need no further comment here. The problems of selection and arrangement are formidable, and the limitations of space are so rigorous that the reader tends to forgive omissions and to marvel at the wealth of material collected. From an ideological and aesthetic point of view, the *Calender* would have gone better with the *Complaints* and the *Hymnes* with the *Amoretti* and marriage songs, but we are told that practical considerations of space governed the present arrangement.

In preparing this review I have confined myself to the two points which concern every user of this volume: the accuracy of the text, and the reliability of the commentary and other apparatus.

In every case except that of the *Daphnada*, which follows the

second quarto, the texts of the first quartos have been followed with such meticulous care that even misprints and obvious errors have sometimes been reproduced. Aside from the *Calender*, the only serious mistake which I have discovered in the text is the printing of "and" for "with" in the first Hymn, line 86. In the second Hymn, line 147, the quarto reading "perform'd" has been retained, although "deform'd" is required by the context and supplied by many editors, as the Variant Readings show.

Moreover, the arrangement and typography of the Quartos has usually been imitated with such fidelity that one regrets that the date "1591" at the end of the prefatory letter to *Colin Clout* appears on the same line as the designation of place, day, and month, instead of by itself on the line below, as it stands in the quarto. On pages 186-8 the presence of a running title over the *Doleful Lay of Clorinda* gives a false impression that the *Lay* has a title in the original. It does not.

The Variant Readings are not quite as reliable as the text. I have noticed the following mistakes and omissions:

In *Colin Clout* l 14, the quarto (a version) reads "shepherd" with a small s, as in the text, not with a capital, as recorded. Commas go unrecorded after "fee" in l 370, "this" in l. 436, "*Vrama*" in l. 487, and colons after "led" in l 796, and "reulle" in l 920. In l 792 a modern *u* replaces the *v* in the reading of "vses" ascribed to the Quarto, and there are several other lapses of this kind. Line 265 reads "more," l 270 reads "*Lunday*", l 292 reads "*Colin*", and there are other cases where italics have been omitted in the Variant Readings.

In the Ded. of *Daph.*, l 12 is misnumbered 13; and there is no record of the comma after "Lyon" in l 18 of Q2 (the text used for this edition). In the text of the poem commas should have been recorded after "vainnesse" l 34, "beare" l 67, and "paine" l. 436, and a colon after "fynd" l 3, and the word division "else where" in l. 52.

In the *Hymnes* a comma should have been recorded after "beleene" in l. 257 of the first hymn, and a period appears by mistake after "great" l 238 in the third.

The text of the *Shepheardes Calender* is almost a facsimile reprint of the first Quarto, with editing confined to the correction of misprints and punctuation. But the list of Variant Readings is so inaccurate as to affect the usefulness of the text, because the text retains some misprints of Q1; for example, the reading "Eternal night" in the gloss to *November*, l 165, is reproduced, and the Variant Readings fail to note that it was corrected to "Eternal night" in Q3. When misprints have been corrected in the text, the original reading is sometimes given in the Variant Readings, and sometimes not. The result is that when the reader comes upon such a thing as the spelling "accountp" in the Argument for *October*, l. 4, he cannot tell whether that is the spelling of the first quarto, which it is, or a misprint of the *Variorum*.

Actually I find very few misprints in the text of the poem:

In three cases a modern *v* has replaced the original *u*. *Ded* Epist 25 3, and *Nov* 1 56 read "have" for "haue," and the gloss for *Feb* 176 reads "figuratively" for figuratiuely". In *Dec* 1 69 a final *e* has been omitted from "Todestoole". In *July* 1 191 the "theyre" of Q1 is silently emended to "theyrs" as in Q3, 5. This is probably a mistake, since the singular form corresponds to "other" for "others" in the same line. At any rate the variant should certainly have been recorded.

Unfortunately, the text of the glosses is less accurate.

In the gloss for *Feb* 47, an *e* has been dropped from "downe", on the Emblem, in 1 14 the "me" of Q1 is silently corrected to "men". March 97 14 reads "becometh" in Q1, although De Selincourt, Renwick, and the *Variorum* all read "becommeth". *April* 50 18 reads "himselfe", *May* 191 reads "pupill" and *May* 219 reads "craty" in Q1, "craftye" in Q3, and "craftie" in Q5, yet the *Variorum* reads "crafty" with no notice of the variants.¹ In *May* 232 there is no authority for the reading "That gotes," the Quartos read "The gotes". On the *July* Emb, 1 9 Q1 reads "in supremacie" not "is supremacie". And in *Oct* 78 "Tom piper" of the Quartos becomes "Tom Piper" of nursery rime fame.

It seems to have been the intention of the editors to record all departures from Q1, even to "inversions, repetitions, and misspellings," but, in fact, even so important a variant as the "his" "her" which represents a correction in printing of Q1, is not noted in the Variant Readings, although it is commented upon on p. 696. I have noticed more than a dozen misprints in Q1 which are corrected in the *Variorum* but not noticed in the list of Variant Readings. Some of these are recorded in Professor Renwick's edition. But the editor of the Variant Readings does not ignore that edition entirely, for he disagrees about the mark after "habilities" in the Dedictory Epistle 20.8, which Professor Renwick describes as an inverted semicolon but the *Variorum* records as a question mark.

In the arrangement of the glosses, the *Variorum* follows modern practise and rearranges the words glossed in the order in which they occur in the text. In every case but one, the disorder of the Quartos is slight and probably without significance. But in the gloss to *April*, the notes to words in lines 92, 99, 73, 82, and 86-7 occur, in that order, between the notes to words in lines 136 and 145. This situation may be the result of after-thoughts on the part of E. K., but it could equally well be the result of a last minute rearrangement of stanzas in the famous Lay to Eliza. The misplaced glosses involve three stanzas, 5-7, of the Lay and may indicate that these three stanzas, in the order 7, 5, 6, stood between stanzas 12 and 13 when the glosses were written. The point seems to have been overlooked by Dr. Roland B. Botting, in his interesting study of the order of composition of the *Calender* (*PMLA*, I, 423-34 and

¹ In checking the texts of the Quartos, I have had access only to the Spenser Society facsimile of Q1 and the Harvard copies of Q3 and Q5. Fortunately these are the most important quartos.

Variorum, pp 276-7), and it would be missed by anyone who relied on the *Variorum* to report fully the text of the first Quarto.

On the other hand, the unusual use of the small period within the sentence, which is a peculiarity of Q1, is carefully reproduced in the *Variorum*, as it is in Renwick's edition. De Selincourt follows the practise of later quartos of converting it into a comma, colon, or full stop, and as a result he sometimes punctuates sentence fragments as if they were complete sentences. I have noticed only one case in which this period has been inadvertently replaced by a comma, after "sonder" in the *March* gloss 97.14. Otherwise, the punctuation of Q1 has neither been scrupulously preserved, nor have all of the departures from it been recorded, although the intention seems to have been to record such departures in the Variant Readings. Sometimes these changes have considerable bearing on the interpretation of the text, as in the case of the comma after "Hobbinol" in *January*, l 55. This comma appears in Q3 and 5, but not in Q1, and I do not think it belongs there. At least the reading of Q1 should have been recorded in the list of Variants.

But if the record of Variant Readings is incomplete for Q1, it is entirely inadequate and also inaccurate for the other quartos. This situation is most unfortunate because, as far as I know, the modernizations of Q3 and Q5 have never been taken fully into account by students of Spenser's archaisms. Yet they constitute perhaps the best source of evidence for what was considered archaic or unusual in the language of the *Calender* in Spenser's day. But even the variant readings which are noted cannot be relied upon because they are full of mistakes and misprints. In particular I notice that there is a general tendency to misrepresent the readings of Q3.

The construction of the commentaries, on the other hand, has been done by a careful and painstaking editor. Apparently all quotations of source material have been checked and corrected. Sometimes the text cited has been changed to some better or more easily available edition. For example, in the quotation of Reissert on p 317, the Petrarch citation is clearly a mistake and the editor suggests the passage probably intended and names his edition. Again, on p. 328, Reissert quotes only a line and a half from Mantuan, and the editor supplies several additional lines which are pertinent.

The notes from previous editions seem to have been collected with considerable thoroughness, and the inclusion of some very early comments suggests that the still unpublished *Spenser Allusion Book* has been utilized. Professor Renwick's important edition of the minor poems has been culled with great thoroughness. Except for some valuable notes on the glosses, and a few editorial comments, everything except the linguistic notes has been included. A good deal has been collected from his introductory matter also, but we

will still have to refer to his edition for his opinion on many points since many comments which appear in his edition are here credited to earlier editors and commentators. But when these have been removed, the volume and value of his contribution to the study of Spenser's minor poems is still impressive. Herford's edition of the *Calender* is also fully represented except for his numerous paraphrastic and linguistic annotations.

I miss from the Bibliography Miss Vere L. Rubel's study of *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance* (Modern Language Association Revolving Fund Series XII, 1941), and wonder why G. C. Moore Smith's note on "St. Bridget's Bower, Kent," which appears in the Bibliography, is not briefed on p. 328 where the passage is annotated. But on the whole the commentary is thorough and comprehensive.

Cross-referencing and regular editorial comment knit together the miscellaneous criticism much more adequately than in the earlier volumes. Great care has been taken to avoid repetition and save space. The appendixes have been kept to a minimum, and the policy of reprinting articles in full, especially those by the editors, has been abandoned. Those who are interested in special topics, such as the identity of E. K. or of Rosalind, or the philosophy (as distinct from the source) of the *Hymnes*, may find the appendixes too brief to be useful. But research students must go back to the original discussions in any case, and what is given is sufficient, in most instances, for purposes of general reference.

The final rechecking of the typescript or the galley proof, which drains the last ounce of editorial patience, has evidently been omitted, for occasionally a line has been dropped out or a mistake which no proof-reader could be expected to catch, has been let stand. In very few cases are these serious enough to affect the general usefulness of the volume. But I notice, for example, that on p. 279 eight words have been omitted from the quotation of Herford's comment on line 35. The omission begins and ends with the word "even" and anyone who has checked copy can see what happened. Again, on p. 353, seven words have dropped out of the quotation from Renwick after the words "Mantuan's complaint" in the fourth sentence, and the resulting statement is rather startling. Usually these mistakes are unimportant, as on p. 401, of the quotation of Renwick, where a necessary "are" has been silently supplied in line 6, and, in line 13 a "the" has been omitted. Occasionally the sense is affected, as on p. 382, in the quotation of Herford on ll. 37-54, where "enforces" has been changed to "refuses" in line 5. The editorial addition to line 6 of this note "See Kluge's note above" should read "below" since the quotation appears on the following page. One of the most amazing misprints is that of "Ariosto" for "Aristeo" on p. 250 in Renwick's comment on lines 55-60.

The effort to give every author his due sometimes results in the printing of the poorer or less useful note in place of the later and better one. Most of the source hunting of Reissert and Kluge, for example, has been made available in English by later editors. Several times, as on p. 335, lines 187-200, chronological considerations involve an editorial supplying of two pertinent lines which are given by Renwick, but are not here credited to him. On p. 335, lines 217-28, the suppression of Renwick's note is a loss because it supplies several facts not mentioned in the earlier notes cited from Todd and Herford. And on p. 337, where Renwick's comment has been shifted from the text to the gloss, and the beginning has been omitted as covered by Kluge's note on ll. 73-4, what is left is no longer self-explanatory. On pp. 385-6 chronological scruple results in the quotation of consecutive lines from Mantuan in reverse order. Renwick presents a clearer picture of the borrowing by printing the lines consecutively. The notes on the December eclogue omit Renwick's frequent citations of Marot's French, citing instead Morley's translation wherever that is available, so that the reader is presented with parallels partly in English and partly in French. See, for example, the notes on lines 77-90. Sometimes, as on p. 337, gloss 74, the effort to avoid repetition results in unintelligibility, as in the note attributed to Herford. If the information was not to be repeated, reference should have been made to Kluge on ll. 73-4 and Warton on 74. On p. 248, ll. 19-42, where the latter half of Renwick's quotation of Petrarach is omitted, perhaps no harm has been done at that point, but the omission makes unintelligible Renwick's note on ll. 49-53, repeated on p. 250, where the missing part of the quotation is referred to.

Sometimes the editorial instinct is so strong as to defeat the Variorum purpose, as on p. 613, where Renwick's discussion is very inadequately represented partly because the editor quoted part of it in his own discussion of the problem on p. 610. On p. 321 there is an editorial note on "Menalcas" in l. 102 instead of a reproduction of Renwick's better note which gives the date of the marriage. On p. 337 Herford quotes only the Greek line. The translation which is substituted should have been credited to Renwick as should also the editorial comment on E. K.'s confusion of two Greek words. Occasionally the square brackets which indicate editorial comment have been omitted, as in the case of the last line on p. 300, and in the case of a good many quotations of source material.

But if the book lacks the fine finish of expert editing, it nevertheless represents a bringing together of scattered materials which is most useful. It will be invaluable to teachers of Spenser, and to their students, for many years to come. It is easier to list mistakes than to describe the accomplishments of the work, and to those who know something of the difficulties under which the editors have labored, any carping about the result must seem the sheerest ingrati-

tude. Whatever its faults, the edition is a landmark in the field of Spenser studies, and if it is used with caution and intelligence it will serve as a foundation upon which much future work can be built

JOSEPHINE WATERS BENNETT

Hunter College

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight Re-edited from Ms Cotton Nero, A X by Sir ISRAEL GOLLANCZ, with introductory essays by MABEL DAY and MARY S SERJEANTSON Published for the Early English Text Society by Oxford University Press, 1940. \$3 25

It had been a matter of quiet knowledge among the many friends of the late Sir Israel Gollancz that, off and on through many years, he was engaged upon an edition of the present poem. His assiduity and energy carried him far in this labor of love, but he did not live to see its completion. What he left still to do, his former pupil, Miss Day, has now done. Her loyalty to her teacher has carried her further than the mere collection and stitching together of portions of his work. She has supplemented and revised what her master had done, whenever and wherever the progress of scholarship and the passage of time made change or correction necessary, and not infrequently this has meant sewing quite a new patch on the older garment. Dr Mary Serjeantson has indeed contributed to the book a section dealing with the language of Ms Cotton Nero A. X (though she has not attempted to "localize" the poet's speech with any precision), but the lion's share of the work of getting out the present edition, I happen to know, has fallen upon Miss Day. In pious duty to a revered teacher she has sought to keep herself and her share in the task well in the background. At times, I can imagine, she may have been prompted to delete or change what she found set down, but if so, she never forgot that it was to be Sir Israel's book, not her own. Yet her thorough acquaintance with the works of the poet, her practised knowledge of an editor's task, and her resolve that the final work should be, as far as she could make it, a unit free of those gaps and contradictions that are apt to appear when two editors work on one poem, have made it in some measure her book as well as his.

Text, Notes, and apparently the Glossary, are the work of Sir Israel, though the last two incorporate material published after Gollancz's death, and thus give evidence of Miss Day's revising hand. I have some reason to believe that the text stands pretty much as the first editor left it. Certainly the very large number of emendations, more numerous in this edition than in Sir Israel's

BEETS revision of 1919, indicates that he has been allowed to have his way with the text, and that Miss Day did not feel free to interpose her editorial hand. The essays introductory to the text are, however, the work of the reviser, and since she speaks with the authority of a master upon the *Gawain*-poet, a brief résumé of her views is very much in order.

For a date of the poem we still have insufficient evidence, though for working purposes one in the later decades (Miss Day's "last decade") of the fourteenth century seems safe enough. Miss Day brings forward some new evidence for the chronological order. *Patience*, *Purity*, *Gawain* (with nothing said about *Pearl*), though she feels that a certain interval of time elapsed between the writing of *Purity* and that of *Gawain*. She notes, as did Menner before her, evidence of phraseology in the Cotton Nero Ms parallel to that of the *Wars of Alex*, and, indeed, finds additional parallels, but, quite rightly, hesitates to say which author it was who borrowed from the other.

Each reader of *Gawain* and *Pearl* who is familiar with the North-west Midlands has, I suppose, his own private predilections for the locale in which the events of *Gawain's* sojourn took place, and Miss Day is good enough to give us hers. She would place the "Green Chapel" at Wetton Mill, Staffordshire to speak more precisely, at the cave called Thursehole, i. e., "fiend's house," situated at the bottom of the valley where Hoo Brook runs into the Manifold River. Such a localization, of course, cannot be proven or disproven. Miss Day remarks, rightly I think, that the Green Chapel was a spot well-known to the poet, who describes it in fullest detail, but, according to Miss Serjeantson (*RES.* 3. 327-8), his language is a more northerly speech than that of Staffs, and in the absence of other evidence, that fact tells somewhat against the identification. I think I could suggest a locale whose speech is closer to that which the poet utters, and whose situation would explain something of the political and social background of its events, but *sum curque* is a good motto, and I am delighted to see that Miss Day not only has her own views as to the background of the poem, but sets them forth in a fashion that is suggestive, if not completely convincing.

On the sources of the poem, Miss Day presents arguments that are illuminating and, to me, convincing. As scholars have long recognized, two main stories, "The Beheading Game" and "The Temptation," make up its single and unified plot (I use those adjectives advisedly). Variant versions of the "B. Game" are to be found in Irish, O. French, and O. H. German, and of the "Temptation" in the French and in two Italian canzoni possibly derived from OF. romance. But with all this wealth of analogues and variant versions, scholars have been unable to agree as to where the poet got the material of his story and how he put it together.

Professor Kittredge, 'a noble prechour in this cas,' believed that *Gawan*, as we now have it, is largely a rendition in English of an original French poem in which the two stories found a final combination. Directly contrary to his view, which has long held the field, is that of Miss von Schaubert, that the two stories did not exist together in any French original, but were joined by the W. Midland poet himself, and that the lack of skill with which the two parts were put together is evidence that her theory is the true one. Opposed as they are one to another, both these views arise, however, from a single way of regarding not only this poem, but other medieval poems as well. Both Kittredge and the lady from Germany are members of the "Source" school, now beginning, I think, to lose some of its former prestige in the scholarly world. According to those who accept its *Credo*, nearly every work of medieval literature must have a "source" to guide the unbalanced reason or check the wayward fancies of a writer. Thus it comes about that when no direct "source" can be found, the apostles of this school are quite willing to invent one. It has, of course, been proven again and again in the long history of literary scholarship that study of the sources of a poem has led to the discovery of new facts about it (to say this is almost banal), and it is also true that the medieval author was less disposed than his brethren of subsequent centuries to care about the literary virtue of originality, yet the literary virtue of "invention" was not unknown in the medieval centuries. It is to Miss Day's honor that, far more than any previous editor or commentator, she is willing to believe in the inventive power of the *Gawan*-poet, willing to believe that he possessed sufficient intelligence to weigh and then to select the raw material that went to fashion his story, and sufficient taste to weave its strands into the pattern of a plot. Consequently she shows little sympathy for Dr. von Schaubert's argument, *viz.* that the lack of skill with which the parts of the combined story are put together indicates an English origin for *GGK.* (a strange argument indeed), and less for that of Kittredge, *viz.* that all the correspondences and parallels between our poem and its numerous analogues would have had to have been embedded in a direct and immediate French original.

Just how the two stories of the "Beheading Game" and "The Temptation" were brought into combination has puzzled many, but combined they were, and only the poet knows how.¹ Miss Day calls our attention to one way in which the union might have been consummated. Each of the stories, she points out, is a story of a

¹ As far as the mechanics of the plot be concerned, the two parts are united by the device of the Exchange of Winnings, found in no other analogue of the story. Miss Day suggests that if the two stories were originally distinct, the device might have been invented or adapted from some fabliau for the purpose of connecting them.

test, each illustrates one and the same moral obligation: "a promise once given must be kept, even though unforeseen circumstances appear to make death the cost of keeping it." This obvious moral swings the plot of *Gawain* into line with the plots of *Patience*, *Purity*, and *Erkenwald*, each of which illustrates a moral virtue.

I cannot help feeling that Miss Day is right in allowing the poet to have a larger share in shaping the plot of his story than previous commentators have been willing to grant him. It does not seem unreasonable to believe that the poem is what it is in composition and structure not so much because of a hypothetical (very hypothetical) source as because of the poet. He was familiar with French romance, and would, quite naturally, feel free to cull thence what he liked and leave out what he didn't. According to Miss Day, he evidently knew well the *Perlesvaus* (p. xxxi). It is interesting to note that one of the stories which Dr. von Schaubert thinks may have given him the idea of the "Temptation"—that of the hermit and the provost of Aquileia—is also to be found in *The Book of the Knight of La Tour-Landry*, and there is some evidence that the W. Midland poet knew that book. As our knowledge stands at present, one is justified in believing that our author's choice of materials for his story was more eclectic than scholars have supposed, and that the neat family-tree of the descent of *Sir Gawain* given in the Tolkien-Gordon edition should be regarded as a stimulant to our thought rather than a conclusive chart of the way in which the mind of a fourteenth century poet worked.

All that we now know, or can learn from the text, deepens the impression that the poet had a good deal more say in the composition of his own story than the "Source" scholars are willing to admit. No *Ur-Gawain* (French or English) has yet been found—not the faintest trace of one. As Miss Day points out, when the poet speaks of the book that told of Gawain's *amours uyage* (689-90), he cites it as the authority for those very passages which seem to have been of his own composing. Furthermore, when he tells us that he heard the story *in toun*, and that it had been long in the land "locked in leal letters," he also tells us that it was an *outrage aventure* of Arthur's wonders, a strange or unusual tale, i. e. one not previously known or accessible to the general run of hearers or readers, and he supports this last statement by the manner of his telling it, which is independent and unhampered, without reference to previous tellers or appeals to precedent authority. One should note that there is no transition whatever between the allusion to the tale locked in leal letters (29-36) and the start of the actual story (37 ff.). The ropes that tie him to that "source" (?) have been cleanly cut, and he is off on his own, running free.

The text of the poem has been more carefully read with the result that the notes at the bottom of the page are fuller and more inform-

ing than those of previous *EETS*. reprints. Trips to the Gollancz volume of facsimiles of 1923 need be less frequently made. For this relief much thanks! One will be less thankful, however, that emendations are more numerous than in any previous edition. Some are ingenious. *W(atz)* for *Ms. With* 1315 can be fairly explained as a case where the eye of poet or scribe was misled by *with* of previous line. But emendation is certainly unnecessary in the following lines 60, 77, 100, 144, 171 (see *TLS* Jan 25, 1941), 508, 660, 769, 835, 862, 864, 867, 877 (where the important *wh* spelling should be kept), 992, 1014, 1028, 1082, 1112, 1145, 1283, 1295, 1386, 1434, 1440, 1623, 1700, 1724, 1738, 1769, 1810 (*your*), 1848, 1941, 2029, 2053, 2055, 2056, 2096, 2110, 2187. There is certainly no need of the extra line 2445* which Gollancz has supplied (if it be he who has supplied it, as I think it is). Some of these emendations irritate one. On 867-8 we are told that the change from *on* to *ouer* improves the metre! It is no duty of an editor to "improve" upon what his author has written. Research subsequent to the "improvement" often has shown that the "improved" line has not been improved at all. In the present instance the change from *on hves* has eliminated a phrase that may be important in the description of the robe Gawain wears. I mention a few instances where a different punctuation would (in my opinion) present the poet's meaning more clearly or improve the movement of the narrative. A period instead of the comma should stand at the end of 1441. In 1847 Emerson's suggestion of the question mark after *hit-self* seems sensible, as does a comma after *dressed* in 2009. In 1396 *Forze* should certainly be *For ze*.

The explanatory notes are, on the whole, excellent. In this text care has been taken to give credit to previous commentators, though in the note on *scholes* 160 Emerson's "shoe-less, i. e. without mail shoes," certainly deserves some consideration. *for hys mayn dvntez* 336 need present no difficulty, if one supposes that Arthur was swinging the ax about in "practice strokes." On 452 the comment that "the syntax is awkward" seems a little naive. The condensed, charged utterance of the poem, much of it in direct discourse, is full of ellipses and parentheses, and never more so than when the G. K. is speaking. Here his speech runs as follows: "to fetch such a dint as thou hast dealt—you have deserved it!—to be readily yielded on New Year's morn." 992 *Ms. kyng* should stand for the emended *lord* for, as Emerson suggests (*JEGP*. 21. 378), the host is assuming the title of "King of Christmas." 1020-23 present an apparent crux that has puzzled many a teacher—and these editors too. As the *Ms.* stands, one would seem to count off in these lines four days, Xmas, St. Stephen's (Dec. 26), St. John's (Dec. 27), Childermas (Dec. 28). Now the last three days of the month were occupied by the three hunts. It certainly looks as if our poet had erroneously made St. John's Day the last of the four

days that precede the hunts. Since Gollancz (?) believes, quite rightly I think, that such an error is unlikely, he is forced to the conclusion that some such line as

With most myrþe and mynstralsye Childermas sued

was omitted. The conclusion is in no way warranted. The timing of the story is clearly explained in a note on these lines in the excellent translation of Professor T. H. Banks. Gawain and his fellow-guests do not retire from the festivities of the 27th until the morning of the 28th (1029). After they retire, all sleep through December 28th. On the morn of the 29th the guests depart to their homes and their host to his hunting, and on the morrow of that same day Gawain's hostess makes the first of her three visits. 1265-7 contain one of the cruces of the poem. To date Dr. Menger's reading of *vysen* (1266) is the most satisfactory solution of it presented, yet it is neither noticed nor alluded to. In 1467 a comedy of errors has been enacted. The writer of the note defines *schafted* as "set, with long rays streaming across the sky, i. e. the boar-hunt continued all day." He then declares that "the interpretation does not involve, as Emerson . . . and TG assume, holding that the sun set at this point of the story." Now it was actually Emerson himself who suggested that *schafted* did not mean "set." Two mutually contradictory statements appear in the note, a renowned scholar is blamed for an interpretation he never advanced, and we are led to believe that the interpretation here advanced is the editor's own, when actually Emerson advanced it! There is no need to suppose that a line has been omitted between 1511-12. The lady has broken off her question abruptly, the poem presents other examples of incomplete or broken utterance caused by the emotion of the speakers. In 1573 the phrase *Whette; his whyte tusche;* only amplifies the action of "scraping" remarked upon in 1571. Emendation of *trayteres* to *traueres* has spoiled the sense of 1700; see Emerson, *JEGP.* 21.394 and Savage, *Med. Aev.* 4.199. *Tilleres* 1726 are the greyhounds, who are also "ticklers," see Savage *PMLA.* 46.175. *dryuez* to 1999 does not, as Napier believed, present any special difficulty "day drives off the darkness," where *to* has the meaning in the imperative clause "go to!" 2002 *naked* = "those poorly clad". The poet is speaking in general fashion; it is not intensely cold, but there's enough of the north in the weather to make the naked (= "ill-clad," Matt. 25.36) wish for summer. In 2055 on the editor's own showing, it is unnecessary to emend *Ms. 3if* to *Pus*, if one translates *3if* as in *Macbeth* 3.4.74. 2226 *b; þat lace þat lemed.* I can see no marked difference between the ax that the G. K. holds and the one he carried a year ago. Both had a lace and the implication is that the lace on No. 2 was wound about the handle in the same manner as that on No. 1. We are expected to believe that,

despite the change of scene, the G. K. and his weapon appeared the same 2318 should contain acknowledgment that Sisam (14th Cent Verse and Prose, p. 223) was the first to explain the line 2450 *þat knowes all your knyghtez*, "all your knights know that," i. e. the fact that Morgan had had relations with Merlin 2482 *mony a venture in vale & venguyst ofte* Another case of condensed wording, "and many a venture in vale (he had), and overcame often" Insertion of *he* for *&*, and derivation of the last vb. from OF. *guenchir* are alike unnecessary

Lest I seem too long upon a censorious note, I would call attention to several brilliant bits of elucidation. In 4 a famous crux, *tried for his tricherie, þe trewest on erthe*, is rendered "distinguished (*tried*) for his treachery, the veriest example on earth" The new reading would make us understand that the poet's reference is to Antenor alone, and would render unnecessary the long note on the trial of Aeneas for the concealing of Polyxena It is certainly most alluring. In 420 *Let þe naked nec to þe note schewe*, TG's translation (ordinarily a good one), of *to þe note*, as "in readiness," ought to yield pride of place to our editors' "part where the short hairs were," lower neck, cf OE *hnot*, "close-cropped" (and recollect our poet's fondness for the use of the adjective as noun)

Any attempt to fix or "freeze" the poet's language into a final and settled form for glossary use is foredoomed to failure. Few other English poets have been as cognizant of the penumbra of other possible meanings into which the chief or usual meaning of a word might shade off, few others as sensitive to verbal nuances or associations Such an awareness of verbal values is proof that he was dealing with a highly imaginative living language current on men's lips, not a jargon resurrected from a speech once spoken, but then dead. Even today in the northwest counties of England something of the poet's speech lives on Consequently an editor of *Gawain*, remembering that the poet's meaning is often contextual and impossible of being "frozen" into a single definition, must be willing to list not a single, but a number of meanings under a particular word; and must also have frequent recourse not only to *NED*. but to *EDD* as well. The following remarks upon a few words selected from the Glossary of the present ed. will exemplify the soundness of these caveats.²

byled 2082 is hardly to be der. from OF. *boillir* (E). Der. from OE. *bylgean*, "roar," is one possibility, and another is that it is a verb from ME. *bile*, *byle*, "a boil, swelling." *conysaunce* 2026 here

² In the list below the following abbreviations are employed B = J T Brockett's Dict of N Country Words, 1846, E = O F. Emerson, *JEGP*. 21; L = R B. Peacock, *Glossary of the Dialect of Lonsdale*, 1869; M = A. Mawer, *Chief Elements of Engl Place Names*, 1924; R = J. Ray, *A Collection of Engl. Words*, various editions; W = Mrs. Joseph Wright, *JEGP*. 34 and 35

correctly glossed as "cognisance," and less correctly as "badge," shows us that the poet knew his heraldry, for Planché, *Cycl. of Costume* tells us that the word was sometimes applied to the surcote, jupon or tabard that carried the owner's armorial bearings. *cry* 64, 775 is unglossed, though *kry* 1166 is. *dered* 1460 is not "injured," but as in the dialects "frightened, stunned." For *drif* 1176 cf. L's "procrastinate" *flet* 832, 1653, 1925 does not necessarily mean "hall"; cf. the quot. from *Scots Acts of Parl.* 337 (*N & Q*. 7 Ser. 11. 262), "inner halfe of the hous that is callyt the flett"^s *frayst my fare* 409 may indeed be "ask how I am getting on," but equally well might mean "enquire after my track (or journey)," which is precisely what G. had to do *for*; 2173 is not "waterfall," as E. has shown in his review of TG., but "channel." In 1863 Ms. *for hvr lorde* has been emended to *fro*. The analogy of *for Gode* 1822 establishes *for* = "in the presence of" and obviates the need of emendation. *gayn in com gayn* 1621 is "come towards to meet with" (W) rather than "promptly." *zarked* 820 conveys the idea of a sudden snatch, a quick jerky motion (*Dict of N Riding*, 1928), a meaning more appropriate to the raising of a portcullis than the colorless "opened" *zet* 1894 = "still" is not glossed. So also with *hole* 1569, "a hole" or possibly "a narrow valley." *hore* 743 is rightly "hoary," but in folk-speech is often applied to trees when covered with lichen (M.). The phrase *lf for lyf* 98 may be der from the tournament; cf. Span. *juntaron se cuerpos con cuerpos* (Ayala I. 454), and Froissart's *body to body* (Johnes' *Criticism*, 1839, p. 151). *loke* 2438 might equally well be "lock, knot," as well as "look." *may* 1795 is "wife" not "maiden," see my note MLN. 55 604. *mery* 1736 may be OE. *mere* "bright excellent" with final *y* for *e* (E.). *mornynge* 1751 may not be "anxiety" but "morning" (E. & W) If it be not telling tales out of school, it was no less a person than Miss Day who suggested in 2467 the reading *pyn aunt* for *py naunt*. But quite evidently she has not felt free to insert her own excellent emendation, even though the alliteration of the line is vocalic. *olde* 1124 is "eminent, great" (W.). *orpedly* 2232 is "truculently" (W.) rather than "boldly." *pine* to 123 is "difficult to" (R) *race* 2076 is rather "blow, cut" than "attack." Is *reled* 1728 necessarily a pret. 3 pers. sg.? Is it not rather past part. of NED.'s *reel* v¹ or *reel* v²? Cf. *Pat* 147 for an occurrence of the first vb. I offer the suggestion that *rymez* 1343 may be dial. *rim*, "the peritoneum inclosing the intestines", in which case the form is plural because the poet knows of the two portions of that organ in mammals, the *parietal* and the *visceral layers*. *ronez* 1466 might safely be glossed as "whin bushes" (B). *sadly* 2409 is here "pleasantly, satisfactor-

* This meaning of *flet* appears in *Beowulf*, line 1086.—Ed.

ily" (E), cf. *Pat* 442. *sette* 1077, 1971 retains the meaning of ON. *setja*, "place or set in the right direction." *slade* 1159, 2147 may very well be "flat, moist ground in a valley" (L). *sturne* 143 is more definite than the gloss "strong"; W. gives "formidable in bulk, massive." *sweyed* 1429 is "swung to one side, inclined" (B) rather than "moved", the pack is well-trained, all its members move as one. *pus much* 447, "all this, as follows" (W), should be glossed under one or the other of its members *wayte* 306, 1186 can perfectly well be our modern "await" rather than "watch, search" W. glosses *wyndow* 1743 as "aperture between the curtains of the bed." *wynne* 2420 seems to me to be better translated "struggle" (W) than "joy." W., quite soundly I think, suggests that *wlonk* 2022 is an adverb. *won* 1238 is certainly from OE *wun*, "pleasure" (E.), rather than from ON. *van* which gives the colorless and quite false "way, custom." G. certainly has no such "ways" or "customs" For *wonez* 2098 cf. *Roch.-Ross Gloss*, *woan*, "to haunt as a temporary dwelling-place." *to wrast* 1663 is better glossed by "against the grain" (W) than the editors' "virtue." *Wrezande* 1706 refers to hounds and not to men, hence E.'s "denouncing" is better than "shouting."

The present edition, combining, as it does, all the brilliant inventiveness of Sir Israel and many of his best inspirations, with Miss Day's sound scholarship and rich experience as general editor of the EETS., unites the virtues of both its makers, and is, therefore, charged with a higher scholarly "potential" than other editions less happily launched. It will have its effect upon all that is written or said in future on the poetry of the Alliterative School.

HENRY SAVAGE

Princeton University

The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature. By GEORGE SAMPSON. Cambridge, England: At the University Press. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. xvi + 1094. \$4.50. ("College Edition," \$3.40.)

While this review remained unwritten, other reviewers got promptly to work. With one voice they have acclaimed Mr Sampson's *History* as "a masterpiece," "magnificent," "completely satisfying," "a brilliant compact summary," "fresh and readable," and "a notably powerful book." Your reviewer is at last ready to join the chorus, with some particulars and warnings which the less deliberate brethren were not able to give. Mr Sampson has long been known as a capable editor and vigorous writer. He has carried out the present formidable task as if he had been provi-

entially designed for it, and also as if it had been no task at all, but a continuous pleasure. He has more than earned our gratitude and praise. But, of course, in using this new resource for teaching and study, we will want to know exactly what we have, and to this question we now turn.

The views concerning the study of literature presented in the Preface are those more fully set forth, and defended, in Mr. Sampson's *English for the English* (1921), and they appear to better advantage in that spirited, excellent, though not unchallengeable book, which every teacher of English ought to know.

The fourteen volumes of the *Cambridge History* become fourteen chapters in the *Concise History*, and the chapters of the parent work become numbered sections within Mr. Sampson's chapters. Thus the scope of *CHEL* is faithfully reflected in the *Concise History*, and, in addition, Mr. Sampson has brought the story down to the present time, principally in a fifteenth chapter on "Late-Victorian and Post-Victorian Literature" filling 111 pages, but also in passages inserted in earlier chapters. The *Concise History* is, therefore, far more comprehensive than any other one-volume history of English literature known to your reviewer. That the matter of *CHEL* has not become a bundle of dry bones may seem to be almost a miracle, though it can be explained. The secret lies in the freedom which Mr. Sampson has exercised. His Preface is, on this subject, extremely deceptive. It need scarcely be added that he can have had no intention of misleading the public, but, in fact, he has not written an "epitome," though he thinks he has. He is really as independent in the greater part of the first fourteen chapters as he is in the last. He has written the whole book according to his own lights, views, and standards, saying all that he wants to say in his own lively, vivid, and pointed fashion as he travels easily down the centuries, and not only discarding much, but boldly departing from *CHEL* wherever that suits his purpose.

Hence this *Concise History* can at no point safely be used as a summary of *CHEL*. And though it reproduces the framework, it does not conform to the scale of *CHEL*. In the original American edition of *CHEL* (used also later in this review), the chapter on Spenser fills forty-one pages, as against Mr. Sampson's two and three-sevenths pages; but the chapter on Pope fills twenty-seven and one-seventh pages, as against Mr. Sampson's five and one-seventh. Many other alterations in scale are almost as striking. In general, it appears that Mr. Sampson cut away all that he felt he could, in the interest of brevity, but cut more or less in obedience to a considerable variety of reasons having little or no relation to each other. Consequently it is impossible to present them, much more to discuss them, within the limited space here available.

When Mr. Sampson says one thing, and *CHEL* says another, it

is not always easy to determine whether we have a case of unintended distortion or one of deliberate alteration. Your reviewer believes, however, that the great majority of the variations are cases of unintended distortion, arising from the determination to make short, simple, positive statements whether or no. An illustration or two, standing midway between extremes, must be given. Mr Sampson concludes his discussion of *Gorboduc* (p. 241) with the statement that its authors "disregarded the precepts and practice of the Italian followers of Aristotle which insisted on the unities of time and place, and so gave to English tragedy from the beginning that liberty of action which was to be one of its greatest glories." Mr Sampson probably did not mean to say that liberty in itself is a "glory", but, in addition, J. W. Cunliffe in *CHEL*. (v, 78) says nothing of the Italians or of "glories." He merely quotes Sidney's complaint that *Gorboduc* "is faulty both in place, and time," and continues "Whether this were accident or design, it secured to English tragedy from the beginning a liberty which all the efforts of Sidney's group of stricter classicists could not do away with." For another instance, W. H. Hutton (*CHEL*, vii, 168-9) concludes his paragraph on Henry Hammond as follows:

The most valuable of all his work, as literature, are his sermons, models of the best Caroline prose in its simplicity, restraint, clarity, distinction. In his absence of conceits, he shows himself typically a Caroline rather than an Elizabethan. In his avoidance of anything approaching rhetorical adornment, he forms a marked contrast to the school in which we may place the gloomy splendour of Donne and the oriental exuberance of Jeremy Taylor. To write of charity, patience, toleration, befits him better than any other man of his age, and, when theologians and statesmen were wrangling over the limits of the church and the rights or wrongs of the individual in religion, his was almost the first, and certainly the clearest, voice to be lifted up in assertion of toleration as a plain Christian duty and in denunciation of the persecuting spirit as an enemy to religion and truth.

This, becomes, in the *Concise History* (p. 371):

The most valuable of all his extensive works are his sermons, models of the best Caroline prose in restraint, clarity and distinction, and eloquent for a virtue then almost unknown, Christian toleration.

The shades of Taylor, John Hales, and others have definitely less reason to complain against Hutton than against Mr Sampson, and we do not have to ask Hutton, as we do Mr Sampson, what is the difference between "toleration" and "Christian toleration?"

Repeatedly, Mr Sampson does triumph over the difficulties of condensation; and when he fails, he rarely sinks to the level of absurdity exhibited in his concluding sentence on Richard Hooker (p. 168). Nevertheless, he is often guilty of unfortunate distortion; and he often deliberately, yet unfortunately, departs from *CHEL*. The most conspicuous and unhappy instance of deliberate alteration noticed by your reviewer is the whole discussion of New-

man (pp 677-8), but there are other surprising instances. A number of Mr Sampson's interpolations remind us that he was at work in a time of war (though the violent military language at the foot of p 270 comes word for word from Saintsbury in *CHEL.*, v, 252), others bear witness to his fondness for very dubious generalizations about literature and artistic creation (for despite his keenness and balance, he is not a rigorous thinker, and has taken up with a dilapidated theory of art), but a few, it should be added, are wholly felicitous. Nothing could be better than his opening sentences on Dickens's birth and early surroundings (p. 766), for which there is not a hint in *CHEL.*: "Charles John Huffam Dickens (1812-70) was born in Portsmouth His father was Mr Micawber, his mother was Mrs Nickleby."

In his Preface Mr Sampson states that his departures from *CHEL* are those "necessitated by the fact that some of the original chapters were written over thirty years ago." This fairly applies to his final chapter, which, moreover, is a distinguished and sane critical survey, and to certain passages in earlier chapters, such as the treatment of *Piers Plowman* (pp. 60-3) and the discussion of *The Book of Margery Kempe* (p. 97), but in general the differences between *CHEL.* and the *Concise History* have not been occasioned by the elapse of time. They are to be accounted for, rather, by considerations of style and of critical outlook. In the main, Mr Sampson takes his facts as he found them in *CHEL.*, without revision in the light of subsequent scholarly investigation or discussion, and without looking elsewhere for better sources. To take a single example, in *CHEL.* the treatment of Middle English prose is uncertain and contradictory, and so is it in the *Concise History*. The difference is that the uncertainty and the contradictions become more glaring when presented on the smaller canvas of the *Concise History*. Mr Sampson's freedom, then, and his boldness in exercising it, are limited chiefly to form and interpretation, and he thus achieves liveliness and unity on the surface, without really getting everything on one level, any more than it is in *CHEL.*

It is quite possibly unreasonable to wish that Mr Sampson, since he has not actually written an epitome, had exercised greater freedom. No words will be wasted, therefore, on suggestions after the event, though one consequence of failure to grasp the whole problem of a one-volume *Cambridge History* must be mentioned. Mr Sampson himself very well says that his book "is a guide to reading, not a substitute for reading", yet it is almost totally devoid of bibliographical apparatus. There is a reference (p. 3) to Mr Sampson's own *Cambridge Book of Prose and Verse: From the Beginnings to the Cycles of Romance*, but your reviewer has noticed nothing else of the kind on any later page. There is also one reference to the *Cambridge Bibliography* (p. 45), and fairly frequent

mention of the bibliographies appended to the several volumes of the first edition of *CHEL*, but these references do nothing to make good a deficiency which greatly lessens the practical usefulness of the *Concise History*.

Your reviewer has noticed very few misprints—only twenty, to be exact—and none of enough importance to be listed here. But several slips must be mentioned. *The Cloud of Unknowing* is briefly discussed (p. 96) along with Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*, and is said to be "doubtfully his." It is true that this mystical treatise was attributed to Hilton about a century after his death, and that the attribution has been defended as recently as 1924, nevertheless, it is certainly not by him. Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* is said (p. 204) to have been first published in 1561—a mistake for 1621. The "fine sermons" of John Hales of Eton are said (p. 372) to have been published in 1613. One sermon by Hales was printed at Oxford in 1617, but no others, so far as is known, were published during his life-time (he died in 1656). Salmasius is said (p. 450) to have "perished under the cannonading of Milton" in the sixteenth century. Mr Sampson speaks (on p. 454) of "the childless Queen Anne," though she was in fact a childless queen only because all of her seventeen children had died. In speaking inaccurately (following Seccombe in *CHEL*, ix, 281) of Hervey's *Memoirs* (p. 484), Mr Sampson refers only to Croker's edition of 1848, not mentioning the first complete edition, by R. Sedgwick, 1931. The year given (p. 758) for the birth of Oscar Wilde is 1858—a mistake for 1854. Finally, on p. 832 Mr Sampson accords very high praise to Professor Arnold J. Toynbee's *A Study of History*, but gives the title, twice, as *A Survey of History*, and appears not to be aware that the work is still unfinished. It will be agreed, even though this may not be a complete list of slips for which Mr Sampson alone must be held responsible, that he has achieved a high standard of accuracy in a work of vast scope and multitudinous detail extending to more than 500,000 words.

ROBERT SHAFER

University of Cincinnati

The Critical Works of John Dennis. Edited by EDWARD NILES HOOKER. Volume II, 1711-1729. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. cxlii + 587. \$7.50.

This volume, which includes essays from 1712 to 1729 and an appendix of excerpts and letters as a supplement to both volumes, brings to completion Professor Hooker's monumental edition of the critical writings of John Dennis. It will be a satisfaction to many scholars to have the rare and expensive works of Dennis within easy

reach in a usable edition. But the conclusion forces itself upon the reader of these two volumes that the reputation of Dennis has also badly needed scholarly reconsideration. He has been repeatedly re-discovered by eminent men, but no one has hitherto succeeded in modifying greatly the traditional contempt for this supposed sour slave of the rules. The collection of his works was first urged by Dr. Johnson, and later by Southey. The survey of his reputation given by Professor Hooker indicates that Dennis has had many distinguished readers down through the generations, and some of them, including even such men as Wordsworth and Swinburne, have been truly extravagant in their eulogy. The mere fact that he has won the approval and admiration of so many writers of various literary schools and periods is itself a testimony to some enduring value in his criticism, and raises him distinctly above such men as Rymer and Gildon, Landor even placed him above Dryden, and Swinburne above Addison. Now that his critical writings are accessible in a collected edition, it is certain that his importance, both historical and intrinsic, will henceforth be more generally recognized, and that there will be something of a revival of interest in him.

In his learned and thoughtful introduction Professor Hooker surveys the reputation, the critical theories, and the literary judgments of his author. He follows Dennis through his whole career with sympathy and understanding, but also with calm impartiality. The quarrels of Dennis had their worthy as well as their obviously ignoble aspects. Hooker discusses them candidly and objectively, freely admitting faults and also noting extenuating circumstances. Although no narrative of the bitter literary and personal quarrels of that age is likely to satisfy in all its details every modern specialist, the lucidity and reasonableness of Hooker's exposition will tend to moderate the partialities which Dennis and Pope and Addison arouse in modern students even after an interval of two centuries.

Any historical period may be regarded as the sum total of the individuals living in it, and as intelligible only to the extent that we understand these individuals. The Augustan age must be studied successively from the points of view of its great men, Addison, Swift, Pope, and the rest. Certainly it should be viewed also through the eyes of its great professional critic, John Dennis, who practised his profession over a period of thirty-seven years. Dennis is no guide to the majority opinion of his time, he was too much an individualist to speak for anyone but himself. But he throws light on the important critical issues of the time, and to some extent made history by his own contributions to literary theory. His interest in such a doctrine as poetic justice is no adequate measure of his real importance. He expounded the nature of the sublime; as an interpreter of Milton he anticipated and excelled

Addison, although the latter has received the larger credit because he reached a more popular audience, Dennis was, as Hooker points out, an acute critic of drama, and made illuminating observations on the "comedy of manners," on Dryden's *All for Love*, and on Steele's *Conscious Lovers*, which he condemned, he fought Pope, Hooker thinks, not merely because he was irritated by Pope's satirical references to him, but because he thought Pope was drawing poetry away from its appropriate great subject matter. Hooker concedes that Dennis did not understand Pope, on the other hand, Pope, like the late George Saintsbury, clearly did not take the trouble to understand Dennis, whose nature was not so simple as to be encompassed by a text-book formula. Romanticists have found things in Dennis to admire. But Dennis was neither a Romanticist nor a slave to the rules, Hooker judiciously concludes that he was a sensitive and intelligent Classicist.

As in the first volume, the annotations are thorough and generous, often supplementing the introduction by extended historical discussion of Dennis's ideas. Text and apparatus are analyzed in a fifty-page index of names and subjects. These two imposing volumes, the fruit of years of labor, constitute a mature scholarly contribution of a high order.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

Religion and Empire, the Alliance between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion, 1558-1625. By LOUIS B. WRIGHT. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 190 pp. \$2.00.

Modern students have occasionally wondered whether the sainted shrewdness of 16th and 17th century merchant voyagers could have been real, whether their twin loyalties to God and Mammon were sincere or spurious, "a concession to a prevailing cant." Twentieth-century readers have even some tendency to laughter at the strange union of motives. They find a wry humor in the palpable dichotomy, and laugh in the spirit of superior understanding. In *Religion and Empire* Mr. Wright has undertaken to set forth a sounder view of the paradox.

The voyagers were, in fact, profoundly sincere, both in their religion and in their respect for prosperous trade. Every ship was provided with its quota of chaplains. Whatever the state of a sailor's conscience, he regarded divine blessing an essential item in the inventory of a well found ship. The Reverend John Walker went so far as to institute religious discussion groups on board the ship he served, even Raleigh was interested in converting the heathen and in combating the papacy of Spain in the New World.

"From the first voyage of Martin Frobisher, in 1576, onward, the conversion of the heathen became an increasingly prominent motive in the discussions of westward expansion." At all times the merchants regarded their own motives as being essentially religious.

The chaplains themselves inject something of disinterested idealism into the philosophy of empire, for their salaries, about fifty pounds a year, were very low, and they were urgently discouraged from taking part in trade for private gain. Yet they were eager to join the mariners. So keen was the competition for their posts that the merchants could afford to be very critical of clerical applicants, and one Mr. Sturdivant, in 1609, was refused an appointment despite exceptionally good references, because "he hath a strangling humour, can frame himself to all company, as he finds men affected, and delighteth in tobacco and wine" There was occasional delinquency among the seagoing clergy, but for the most part they maintained a rigid integrity.

The clergy of the time were not reluctant to give advice in temporal matters—this is true, apparently, without distinction of sect. Anglican and Puritan alike plunged into the issue of investment and enterprise. Their influence on the effect of mercantile endeavor was great, their effect on its reputation at home and in the light of history was even greater. Some of the chaplains left records of their journeys which were published to win advocates at court and in the market place. Hakluyt and Purchas, particularly, functioned as the propaganda agents of expansion. John Donne's connections with the Virginia Company have been recognized for some years, and it appears that the companies deliberately employed various members of the clergy as "public relations officers." The good report of the merchants in general, and the reputations of mariners in particular, notably of Drake, are directly attributable to sermons and clerical tracts.

Before 1625 the issue between private and public control of imperial enterprise had been defined. Furthermore, the idea of Manifest Destiny had been clearly and positively stated. "Students of American History sometimes talk of Manifest Destiny," Mr. Wright says, "as if it had been invented by President Polk and his contemporaries. But the Puritans who moved inexorably upon the New World had a belief in Manifest Destiny that makes the later American imperialism look anemic and pale" It was the product of the coalescence of several occasionally opposing stresses: the basically religious nature of the seamen led them to wish for the conversion of heathen peoples, their fervid Protestantism redoubled their vigor against Catholic Spain, their political convictions also contradicted the Spanish influence, and their desire for wealth and trade was served even as they served the Lord. From this plexus of motives, none of which may be said to serve another, for all were equally sincere, emerged the vigorous phil-

osophy of empire which finally determined the nature of the New World

Mr. Wright has collected many passages in which the various motives of the merchant voyagers appear in sharp juxtaposition. He has not limited himself, however, to an assortment of illustrations of the essential paradox. During the years between 1558 and 1625 there was a coherent development in the philosophy of empire, derived from a happy fusion of religious, political, and mercantile interests, and formulated with some degree of self-consciousness by the clerical representatives, official and unofficial, of colonial companies. This development Mr. Wright has made clear.

The book is cast in its original form, that of seven lectures delivered at the University of Washington under the auspices of the Walker-Ames Foundation in April, 1942. The notes have been printed together at the back of the book, and there is an adequate index.

HENRY W. SAMS

Queens College

Coleridge's 'Hymn before Sunrise' A Study of Facts and Problems Connected with the Poem By ADRIEN BONJOUR Lausanne Imprimerie la Concorde, 1942. Pp 236

Dr. Bonjour's book is another in the lengthening series of studies focusing on single or related poems by Coleridge and investigating all the pertinent circumstances of their antecedents, conditions of composition, and interpretation. It is admittedly and enthusiastically in the Lowes school of methodology, since Bonjour studied under Professor Lowes at Harvard before completing the present work as a dissertation at Lausanne, and it arrives at some results which should be interesting and provocative to Coleridge specialists.

Bonjour's main purpose is to place the poem in its proper relationship to what he calls the "Dejection Crisis" and to explain certain of its problems and mysteries from this viewpoint. Though perhaps his historical survey of Coleridge's intellectual development, domestic tribulations, physical illnesses, and spiritual moods during the decade or so preceding the writing of the poem is unduly detailed in view of the many biographical treatments of the subject now available, he has nevertheless collected into one usable place all the material bearing on this aspect of Coleridge's life.

The crux of the discussion is found in what Bonjour frankly calls Coleridge's "plagiarism"—particularly his very great and acknowledged indebtedness to Friederike Brun's "*Chamounix beyrn Sonnen-aufgange*," first pointed out by De Quincey. This plagiarism Bonjour explains, partly psychologically and partly medically, as being due to Coleridge's desire, conscious or unconscious, to prove to him-

self and the world that he had recovered his "shaping spirit of Imagination" after he had thought it lost forever. Since, according to medical authorities, the result of a constant and prolonged addiction to opium is frequently a blunting of both the will and the moral sense, Coleridge—perhaps arguing to himself that he had added enough to the original poem of a practically unknown poet to make it his own—weakly attempted to conceal the main source of his work, although openly calling attention to his more general debts to Milton, Thomson, and the Psalms.¹ To these previously recognized literary influences, Bonjour then adds two possible new ones of his own: Helen Maria Williams (in her *Poems* and her *Tour of Switzerland*) and Bishop Thomas Burnet (in his *Theoria Sacra*, Coleridge's knowledge of which Lowes had already demonstrated in *The Road to Xanadu*). Fortunately Bonjour is not inclined to make too much of these parallels, though they contribute their share to the general picture.

In a work printed in English by a foreign press one realizes the difficulty of achieving mechanical perfection. Nevertheless, when, at the climax of a lengthy discussion of the relationship of the newly discovered manuscript of the poem (labeled "*MsH*") to the other manuscripts, one comes upon such a characteristic typographical slip as "we think that the evidence in favour of *MsH* being an intermediate version between *MsB* and *MsH* [read, presumably, *MsF*]" is so strong that no real alternative could possibly be given," then one is justified in protesting against the very inadequate errata list which has been inserted.

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

Northwestern University

The Connecticut Wits. By LEON HOWARD. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943. Pp xiii + 453. \$4 50.

Mr. Howard has made a detailed study of the literary output of four men who were members of a larger, somewhat nebulous group known as the Hartford or Connecticut Wits. John Trumbull (1750-1831), Timothy Dwight (1752-1817), David Humphreys (1752-1816), and Joel Barlow (1754-1812) were all destined to achieve distinction in their lives, although their efforts to create an

¹ This little idiosyncrasy of Coleridge's in concealing certain aspects of his writing which, if recognized, might damage a position he has visualized for himself should surprise no one who is familiar with the alterations and suppressions he introduced into the revised editions of many of his prose works, particularly in those passages dealing with his early political philosophy. For a complete discussion of this matter, see the dissertation by Dulany Terrett, *Coleridge's Politics, 1797-1810*, on file at the Deering Library, Northwestern University.

enduring literature were doomed to failure. As the result of their literary efforts they produced the not inconsiderable total of seventy-five books, besides numerous miscellaneous pieces. Mr. Howard scrutinizes these published works, "not verily for their own sakes," but as representative of the intellectual life and literary pretensions of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. He rightly maintains that exact knowledge of this complex period of our national history is essential if we would understand later literary and cultural developments.

Partly for reasons of economy in space and money, the author dispenses with footnotes. He appends a Check List of the writings of Trumbull, Dwight, Humphreys, and Barlow (pp. 413-426), and Bibliographical Notes for each of his ten chapters (pp. 429-439). The decision to cut documentation to a minimum frees the story to flow without interruption and gives the pages a pleasing appearance. It unfortunately imposes a burden on the reader who may question the facts.

The story begins with an account of Yale College from the year 1763, when John Trumbull entered as a Freshman, to the year 1778, when Joel Barlow, youngest of the four, was graduated. As Mr. Howard says, "The story of Yale, as it affected the Connecticut Wits during their student days, is not a simple one," but he manages to make it one of the most attractive chapters in the book. We learn not only how each one was affected by the formal courses of study, but also of the influence upon him of extra-curricular activities. We hear of inadequate presidents and of tutors who provoked students to revolt, of the library collection in which Trumbull read extensively as a graduate, but which was available to undergraduates only at high cost, and of the disappointment of Dwight, the ambitious tutor, when another man was made president of the college. We are told that Humphreys responded cordially to that part of the curriculum which featured the beauties of rhetoric, and that Barlow was least affected by Yale orthodoxy. All four made progress on what Trumbull called "the flowery road to fame."

Trumbull, the satirist, was first to turn off that road. He produced *The Progress of Dulness* and *M'Fingal*. He later collaborated with his friends in writing *American Antiquities*, but since satire and law did not mix well he prudently and without apparent struggle laid aside his pen to become an eminent jurist in the commonwealth which revered "things as they are."

Timothy Dwight, clergyman, schoolmaster, and eventually president of Yale, wrote much, but his work was untouched by humor and his mind unleavened by imagination. Present day readers leave *Greenfield Hill* and *The Triumph of Infidelity* untouched, although they will browse through the two volumes of travel notes he wrote on his vacation trips through New England and New York.

The other men went farther afield. David Humphreys, honest, superficial, vain, and slow of mind, became minister to Portugal and Spain before he developed a lucrative woolen industry in Humphreysville. He kept on writing through life, as a gentleman should, but what he wrote was mainly rhetoric and today is unread.

Joel Barlow went abroad on business and became involved in revolutionary activities. He numbered among his friends Mary Wollstonecraft and Tom Paine. Deeply stirred by the misery of European social conditions he too wrote an answer to Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, which he called *Advice to the Privileged Orders*. It is the most important of his political utterances. Most of his literary work is well forgotten, but the bitter poem "Advice to a Raven in Russia," written just before his untimely death in Poland, is apropos today. Barlow is easily the most appealing figure of the lot, for his sympathies and faith kept pace with his mind.

It may seem presumptuous to point out that if Robert Fulton married a "young English woman of fortune" (p. 331) it is Mr. Howard's business to supply the proof for this statement, or to mention that *American Antiquities*, Number 11, appeared first in the *Connecticut Courant*, August 6, 1787, ten days before the date of publication given on page 195.

Mr. Howard disclaims any intention of producing a definitive work, but he has put scholars in his debt by his masterly handling of difficult material. He has succeeded superbly in making his "test bore" through the intellectual strata found in the writings of the Connecticut Wits. It is not his fault that the men themselves remain more interesting than anything they wrote.

LOUIE M. MINER

Brooklyn College

Margaret Fuller Ossoli e i suoi corrispondenti. By EMMA DETTI.

Firenze: Felice Le Monnier, 1942. Pp. 370.

This Italian biography, with its appended treasure-trove of letters in three languages, repeats in its general outline the familiar, romantic, and often moving story of the New England transcendentalist and humanitarian, Margaret Fuller. Like antecedent histories of this dynamic woman, it relies heavily upon the *Memoirs*, published records of the Concord group, and also upon the extraordinary collection of her correspondence in the Harvard University Library. Miss Detti, presumably, does not excel certain other biographers in her study of Margaret Fuller's relations with Emerson, Hawthorne, or other New England contemporaries, indeed, much still remains to be done with these subtle intellectual sympha-

thies and antagonisms. Quite naturally her emphasis does not rest upon such problems, nor upon the equally difficult question of the integration of Margaret Fuller's thought with the whole complex pattern of transcendentalism.

Her contributions, however, are as valuable as they are unique in the critical history of the New England group. First, she throws light upon puzzling incidents in Miss Fuller's life abroad, notably upon her affair with the miserable cad, James Nathan, and upon her friendship with the distinguished Pole, Adam Mickiewicz, who is allotted only a few sentences in the most recent biography in English. Of this episode, supported by eight letters of Mickiewicz in the Appendix, Miss Detti remarks acutely.

A noi pare stranissimo che i Biografi della Fuller abbiano completamente trascurato il personaggio di cui ora parleremo. Forse il tono delle lettere da lui dirette a Margaret riusciva poco gradito ai puritani?

In similar fashion Miss Detti is able, unlike the American biographers, to define with comprehension Miss Fuller's association with Mazzini.

This brings us naturally to Miss Detti's second attainment in her study of Miss Fuller, for the first time she makes the life and experience of Margaret Fuller in Italy realities. Knowledge of the places concerned and instinctive comprehension of the European personalities, with whom this gifted product of a Unitarian and Jeffersonian Massachusetts family had such unusual companionship, enable Miss Detti to reveal Margaret Fuller, as we have long wished to see her, through the eyes, so to speak, of this older culture. No previous delineator of Margaret in the Italian setting has been quite at ease. Miss Detti is, she understands the world into which the Cambridge dreamer and humanitarian was so strangely projected. The result is actually the first discriminating record of Margaret Fuller's development after her exit from high-minded but (see Henry James!) provincial Concord.

ANGELO LIPARI

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

Yale University

Tennyson in Egypt: A Study of the Imagery of His Earlier Work.

By W. D. PADEN. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Publications, Humanistic Studies, 27, 1942. Pp. x + 178. \$1.75.

Beginning with an examination of the epigraphs and the footnotes to Alfred Tennyson's poems in *Poems by Two Brothers*, Mr. Paden has extended his investigation of sources to a con-

sideration of what light choice of images in the poetry up to the publication of *Maud* (1855) may cast on Tennyson's mind from youth through "retarded adolescence" to "emotional maturity" (p. 88). From the science of psychiatry he employs three concepts "now considered by psychiatrists to indicate processes which are normal, fundamental, and omnipresent in the human mind" (p. 13). These are "repression," the relegation of certain ideas, images, etc., to the "unconscious" level of the mind, from which they seek to burst, "substitution," the disguised appearance of these ideas, etc.; and "ambiguity," the fact that an image, etc., may have attached to it two attitudes corresponding to the two levels of the mind. Also Paden has considered carefully the ways in which images are selected, recollected, and changed in use. He is aware of the dangers inherent in his type of investigation and has applied his method with great moderation. His conclusions are as follows

The pattern of his [the youthful Tennyson's mind] . . . was not uncommon in kind, though it was unusual in depth and intensity of emotion. In the constricted circumstances of his adolescence his appetites for sensuous pleasure were suppressed and repressed, to a rather unusual degree, by his idealism, his piety, and his fears. The forces of suppression and repression seem to have been symbolized, in his imagination, by his father (pp. 15-16).

In general, Mr. Paden makes his points convincingly, although one would like more evidence than can in the nature of things be forthcoming about the role Tennyson's father played in his mind. He has interesting suggestions to offer on particular matters, especially about the puzzling circumstances of the publication of *Poems by Two Brothers* (pp. 20-21), the attraction and influence exercised by the Oriental work of Sir William Jones and Claude-Étienne Savary (p. 30 ff.), the role of Cleopatra in the "Dream of Fair Women" and its background of imagery (p. 49 ff.), the psychological reasons for the Byronic prose (p. 54 ff.), the influence of Byron on Tennyson (p. 60 and p. 137 f.), and Tennyson's probable use of Faber's *Origin of Pagan Idolatry* with its relation of Arthur to the Helio-Arkite explanation of pagan mythology (p. 76 ff.). On the whole, *Tennyson in Egypt*, though the title is somewhat precious, is a scholarly and thoughtful book.

FRANKLIN D. COOLEY

University of Maryland

This is Lorence, a Narrative of the Reverend Laurence Sterne. By LODWICK HARTLEY. Chapel Hill. The University of North Carolina Press, 1903 Pp. xii + 302. \$3.00.

Mr. Hartley's intention was to write a book about Laurence Sterne "light enough to do justice to the Shandae mood and to be

acceptable to the palate of the lay reader, yet accurate enough to be of value to the student of the eighteenth century and of the English novel." To achieve this dual purpose with complete success is difficult, Mr. Hartley does very well.

He does not pretend to discover new facts. After a critical assessment of material already accessible, he tells with sympathy and understanding the story of Sterne's life and of his career as an author. Students will find eminently sane analyses of Sterne's relations with such contemporaries as Warburton, Mrs. Montagu, Mrs. Sterne, Lydia, Miss Fourmantelle, Mrs. Draper (Mr. Hartley is especially good on Sterne's relations with women), they will find a careful chronological study of the composition and publishing of *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey*. On serious critical problems Mr. Hartley is disappointing. He is, for instance, over-literal in his treatment of the indebtedness to Locke, interesting but limited in his consideration of Sterne's complex presentation of time, conventional in his literary estimates. Walter and Toby Shandy, those supreme embodiments of the "Shandiac mood," are not presented critically at all, and are not sufficiently in evidence. *A Sentimental Journey* fares better than *Tristram Shandy*.

But we must remember Mr. Hartley's intention. He is more satisfactory as a biographer, telling anecdotes with nice selection, with verve and flavor. Why a book on Laurence Sterne should be called *This is Lorence* may at first mystify the lay reader, but the incident explaining the title is characteristic of Sterne's self-conscious irony. It is questionable whether referring familiarly to Sterne (even after maturity) as "Laurie" gives the reader any sense of intimacy, and Mr. Hartley shows strain in attempting to give dramatic immediacy in a few instances where Sterne himself is silent; but there are few faults of this kind. *This is Lorence* is uniformly interesting and entertaining; Mr. Hartley writes with ease, with a sprightliness which enhances the quality of his anecdotes and which seldom becomes merely whimsical.

W. B. C. WATKINS

Kewanee, Tennessee

The Patterns of English and American Fiction: A History. By GORDON H. GEROULD. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1942. Pp. x + 526. \$3.00

Anyone who is not an ideological fanatic will find this a most delightful and profitable guide. Its interests are broader, and its tone is pleasanter, than those of earlier one-volume histories of fiction. It is not chiefly concerned with expounding the supposed influences

of political or economic movements, nor is it ridden by the theory that in novels realism is always preferable to romance. Professor Gerould's tastes are as catholic as they are sound, and he is more desirous to interpret the precise qualities which make certain novels admirable than to argue about the environmental causes which affected them. If his book has any regrettable limitation, it is that he says less than he might have said concerning the underlying philosophical views or moral principles of such writers as Sidney, Fielding, and Jane Austen. But it is of course his privilege to concentrate upon the aspects of human life which his authors portray, and their craftsmanship, and these matters, as well as the personality of the writers, he sets forth with admirable skill. To appreciate his superiority over his predecessors, read, for example, his pages on Scott and on Dickens.

Professor Gerould rejoices in the richness and variety of English and American fiction. To him the historical novel, or the novel of adventure, is as welcome as the realistic and contemporaneous,—provided it recreates the life it professes to portray, with zest and fidelity, provided its characters are really human beings, and provided its settings are in harmony with the tone of the whole story. His judgments are refreshingly independent. He sometimes praises authors who are too little remembered (e. g., Mrs. Gore, Marryat, Marion Crawford), and sometimes condemns others whom it is fashionable to exalt (Joyce, Virginia Woolff). It takes courage to speak the blunt truth that there is turgidity in Hardy's *Dynasts*. Professor Gerould does not try to be iconoclastic, most of his verdicts are in agreement with the best critical traditions. Yet he deflates several celebrities, and consistently deprecates the over-emotional, the violently sensational, and the boresomely purposive.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois



BRIEF MENTION

Down-East Spirituals and Others. Collected and edited by GEORGE PULLEN JACKSON. New York J. J. Augustin (1943). Pp. iv + 296. The brief caption which is thus recorded on the cover of this new and interesting volume is augmented on the title-page by the announcement of "Three Hundred Songs Supplementary to the Author's *Spiritual Folk-Songs of Early America*." In 1937 Professor Jackson issued a collection of religious songs thus entitled, and containing about one half of the spiritual songs that he had found in the southeastern states. At that

time he had begun to speculate, without much conviction, on the possibility that many of the "white spirituals" of the South had been current in New England before they had appeared in the rural song-books of the southern states. In the intervening years Professor Jackson's persistent zeal and his generous determination to find where truth was hid—whether in the Centre, in the South, or in the North—impelled him to an examination of the old song-books of New England and eastern New York, and in the upshot he has found that much of the religious "folk-song" of the Southeast was current a generation earlier in the northeast or "down-east" section which includes Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, and eastern New York. As to the proportion of true folk-song in any such collection we may still look to Professor Jackson for the information which his previous work has taught us to expect from him. "Fairly reliable data," he states, "has been found as to the authorship of about one-third of the song texts in this volume." The Methodist hymnody is bound to derive from the mid-eighteenth century and the authority of the Wesley brothers, whereas the Baptist singing groups, older in point of time, were free both in the matter of text and in that of music. I wish that Professor Jackson, in commenting on the important distinction, had not found it convenient to use the term "folky" (*G. volkisch*) for the popular traditions of the Baptists. But I have no other quarrel with him. In his impressive array of songs, tunes, and excellent notes, he has done me, and all other students of traditional singing, a great service, and in his clear demonstration that the priority is to be found in the Northeast rather than in the Southeast he has presented a picture which is both strange and true, and one which Sir Andrew might consider of equal interest to Christians and to ordinary men.

W. R. MACKENZIE

Washington University

An Outline of Modern Russian Literature (1880-1940). By ERNEST J. SIMMONS. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1943. Pp. vii + 95. Prof. Simmons is to be congratulated on this successful attempt to outline the history of Russian literature since the passing of the Golden Age of the Russian novel about the time of the death of Tsar Alexander II and he is particularly happy in his summary of the period prior to the Russian Revolution. He has grasped the salient features of the leading writers and has expressed them very well. His summary of the Soviet literature is also one of the best brief descriptions that we have but the material is extremely refractory and the constant shifting of Soviet critical judgment under the pressure of political considerations makes it

very difficult to prepare an independent or non-partisan opinion. Thus the final chapter, *Recent Trends in Soviet Literature*, discusses books written during the periods covered in Chapters VIII and IX and in this respect almost seems an afterthought.

The author is trying faithfully to maintain the Soviet point of view even at the risk of being unjust and false to the values of the outside world. Thus in his discussion of Socialist Realism, he says. "The difference between the Soviet realist and the bourgeois realist is essentially a difference between faith in life and lack of faith" (p. 73). Such a statement is both true and false. True, if we accept the highbrow writers of the last years as essentially all that bourgeois society can produce. False if we look at the great numbers of writers of America, England, and other countries who during the past centuries have believed that their countries and their civilizations were on the whole fairly satisfactory. The popular literature of America until recent years has always been marked by faith. It is only as the modern writers have sought to adapt the methods of the older intelligensia of Russia that they have come to value a book by its lack of faith. The great asset of Soviet literature, whether aided by censorship and coercion or by the hope of sales and popularity, has been a return to a healthy condition of acceptance of the social order instead of an atmosphere of discontent and criticism that marked the history of the older Russian literature after the time of Pushkin. There are a few errors and misprints as the name of the book by Pantaleimon Romanov, *Comrade Kislyakov* (p. 55) but on the whole the work is excellently edited and printed. It will be a most valuable addition to the library of Russian works in English and should find many readers and students.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

Mary-Verse in Meistergesang. By SISTER MARY JULIANA SCHROEDER. The Catholic University of America (Studies in German XVI), Washington, D. C.: The Cath. Univ. of America Press, 1942. Pp. xvi + 283. \$3.00. This dissertation deals with a little known phase of late MHG literature: the literary, historical and theological aspect of the recurrence of the Virgin Mary theme in the German *Meistergesang*. After a thorough discussion of the history of the Virgin Mary cult, as instanced in many prayers, hymns and festivities, such as Nativity, Immaculate Conception, Annunciation, Visitation, Purification, Presentation, Assumption, and Coronation, the author shows the recurrence of these themes in the poems of the *Meistergesang* and the changes they had undergone during the late Middle Ages. In this devotion, which is shown to have never been theocentric in character, the *Meistersinger*

had resorted to the Bible and the Apocrypha as their source of inspiration. Quite interesting is e. g. the interpretation of *conceptio* through such men as Hans Sachs, Hans Folz and Lienhard Nunnenbeck. The material is culled from 470 poetical documents, manuscripts and early prints. Of particular value is that group of manuscripts which appears here for the first time (*viz* MSS Berlin 414, Breslau iv F 88 B). Since the texts fortunately are not standardized, they will be of further use for the study of the *Schrifttum* in its various phases. Well documented and presented convincingly, this book is a valuable contribution to the history of MHG literature. A very rich bibliography on *Meistergesang* and the cult of the Virgin Mary in the Middle Ages enhances the value of this dissertation.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College

CORRESPONDENCE

GRETE'S BAD NAME AGAIN. A slight bit of information may be added to Professor Archer Taylor's interesting article on the bad implications of the personal name Grete.¹ St. Margaret, the patron of persons named Grete, is occasionally represented, in art, as seated in prison, with her dragon. An instance of this is a little separately printed anonymous woodcut, probably Dutch, and dating from the last decade of the 15th Century.² It occurs to me as possible that iconographic representations of this kind may have connected St. Margaret with prisons, and her function as Nothelfer, especially asked for easy delivery in childbirth, is certainly connected symbolically with her imprisonment, for the holy lady was herself a virgin. The name might be appropriately given to girls born in prison, though I know of no evidence that it actually was so given. In any case the idea of connecting St. Margaret with girls of bad character because of her picture seems consonant with the popular thought of the old days, delighting in symbols.

THOMAS OLLIVE MABBOTT

Hunter College of the City of New York

¹ *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 452 ff.

² Schreiber, *Handbuch der Holz- und Metallschnitte* (Leipzig, 1930), VIII, p. 94, no. 1616c; reproduced in Hertz Series, *Einblattdrucke des Fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Strasbourg, 1933), LXXVIII, no. 16. The representation is not frequent.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

JUNE, 1944

Number 6

GOTTHILF HEINRICH SCHUBERT UND GOETHE'S "SELIGE SEHNSUCHT"

In Gotthilf Heinrich Schuberts *Ansichten von der Nachtsseite der Naturwissenschaft* (Dresden 1808) lesen wir auf Seite 69 die folgende Äußerung:

Es ist ein ewiges Naturgesetz, das so klar da liegt, daß es sich dem Geist des Menschen zuerst aufdringen müssen, daß die vergängliche Form der Dinge untergeht, wenn ein neues, höheres Streben in ihnen erwacht, und daß nicht die Zeit, nicht die Außenwelt, sondern die Psyche selber ihre Hülle zerstört, wenn die Schwingen eines neuen, freyeren Daseins sich in ihr entfalten. Ich habe in dem ersten Theil meiner schon angeführten Schrift [1 e *Ähndungen einer allgemeinen Geschichte des Lebens*, 1806-20], da wo ich von einem scheinbaren Streben der Dinge nach ihrer eigenen Vernichtung gehandelt, in vielen Beyspielen gezeigt, daß gerade in der Gluth der seeligsten und am meisten erstrebten Augenblicke des Daseyns, dieses sich selber auflöset und zerstört. Es welkt die Blume sogleich, wenn der höchste Augenblick des Blühens vorüber ist, und das bunte Insekt sucht in der einen Stunde der Liebe zugleich die seines Todes, und empfängt in dem Tempel der Hochzeit selber sein Grab. Ja es sind bey dem Menschen gerade die seeligsten und geistigsten Augenblicke des Lebens, für dieses selber die zerstörendsten, und wir finden öfters in dem höchsten und heiligsten Streben unsres Wesens, einen seeligen Untergang. . Jedoch ist jenes Streben nicht vergeblich gewesen, und eben die Gluth jener zerstörenden Augenblicke, für die bisherige Form des Daseyns zu erhaben, erzeugt den Keim eines neuen höheren Lebens in der Asche des untergegangenen vorigen, und das Vergängliche wird, (berührt und verzehrt von dem Ewigen) aus diesem von neuem wieder verjüngt. . Aus diesem Grunde sind jene höchsten Augenblicke zerstörend, weil ein neuauftgehendes höheres Streben das alte verdrängt, weil von nun an die Empfanglichkeit für die Einflüsse des jetzigen Daseyns sich vermindert

Nach einer Beschreibung der Mysterien der älteren Religionen, welche das Wiederaufleben des geliebten Geschiedenen, eine ewige

Wiedererneuerung aus dem Tode verherrlichen, schließt dann das Kapitel mit diesen Worten

Wir halten die Weihe eines wahrhaft guten und heiligen Strebens, mit dem Leben nicht zu teuer bezahlt, und finden in dem Gelingen eines göttlichen Werkes, einen seeligen Untergang. Auf diese Weise pflegt ein kühnes Gemuth mit der Flamme zu scherzen, welche es verzehrt, und es erkennt in seinem Untergange den Anfang eines neuen, immer besseren Strebens, in dem Grabe die höhere Wiedergeburt unsres unvergänglichen Sehns

Beim ersten Lesen dieser Stelle konnte man kaum umhin, sie für eine Erläuterung von Goethes "Seliger Sehnsucht" (*West-östlicher Divan*, "Buch des Sangers") zu halten, belehrte uns nicht das Datum des Buches, daß es sechs Jahre vor der Entstehung des Gedichtes erschienen ist. Jedenfalls besteht zwischen beiden eine überraschende Ähnlichkeit nach Sinn und Ausdruck. Dem höheren Streben bei Schubert entspricht die höhere Begattung bei Goethe, aber es ergeben sich auch die weiteren Parallelen: Kühnes Gemut—der Weise, Gluth der seeligsten und am meisten erstrebten Augenblicke—Sehnen nach Flammentod; Streben nach Selbstvernichtung—Stirb, Keim eines neueren Lebens, höhere Wiedergeburt—Werde. Ja, wenn Schubert davon spricht, wie Psyche ihre Hülle zerstört, "wenn die Schwingen eines neuen, freyeren Daseyns sich in ihr entfalten," so klingt auch das Bild des Schmetterlings, des geläufigen Symbols der Seele an, der bei Goethe freilich bereits der Chrysalide entschlüpft ist.¹

Es stellt sich uns also die Frage, ob Goethe irgendwie durch Schuberts Buch zu seinem Gedichte angeregt worden ist. Dagegen ist in erster Linie einzuwenden, daß, wie Burdach in den Anmerkungen zum *Divan* in der *Jubiläumsausgabe* nachweist, das Gleichnis vom Schmetterling, der aus Liebesbegier verbrennt, in Hammers Hafisübersetzung und "Die verliebte Mücke" bei Saadi zu finden ist, und daß es eine Grundanschauung sufischer Mystik ist, daß "nur durch die Vereinigung mit dem göttlichen Sein, durch das Eingehen in die Glut der göttlichen Liebe, durch freiwilliges Opfer

¹ An einer andern Stelle bei Schubert (S. 79) heißt es "Hiermit verliert der Tod seine Schrecken, und es erscheint in ihm der Moment, wo jene höheren Organe, jene höheren Kräfte, die wir während des Lebens vergeblich erstrebt haben, in uns durch die Flamme eines großen Augenblicks erweckt werden. Alsdann wird der Psyche diese Hülle zu enge, es vergeht diese Form, damit eine neue, höhere aus ihr wiederkehre."

des Leiblichen und asketische Durchflämmung Rettung möglich ist" (Burdach) Dann aber ist auch, ebenfalls nach Burdach, der Romantik die kathartisch-mystische Idee vertraut, "daß aus dem irdischen Tode Leben hervorgeht, die Idee der Sehnsucht nach dem Tode als dem Erlöser von einem Leben, das ein Sterben ist, als dem Spender eines neuen Lebens, als der höchsten Liebesnacht, die alles irdische Liebesverlangen erfüllt und ausloscht."

Allen diesen Voraussetzungen zum Trotz bleibt der stärkere Einklang mit Schuberts sprachlicher Darstellung dieser Idee.

Nun wissen wir aus Goethes Gesprächen, daß er Schubert in Karlsbad 1807 kennen lernte und an dem jungen Mann warmen Anteil nahm, der ihm "seinen damals gefertigten zweiten Band seiner *Anhnungen*" mitteilte.² Am 21. März 1809 erwähnt Goethe Schuberts Deutungsversuch seines *Marchens*,³ und während er noch am 8. December 1808 gegen Riemer bei Gelegenheit der *Nachtseite der Naturwissenschaft* und ihrer Heiligkeit äußert, daß "solche Naturen wie Schubert gleichsam die Molltöne der Natur" seien, das Heilige sich aber auch in Dur-tonen ausspreche, sagt er zu Boisserée am 4. August 1815, also ein Jahr nach Entstehung des Gedichtes, gegen den modernen Mystizismus losziehend, die bitterbösen Worte "Die Protestanten . . . fühlen das Leere und wollen einen Mystizismus machen, da ja gerade der Mystizismus entstehen muß. Dummes, absurdes Volk, verstehen ja nicht einmal, wie denn die Messe geworden ist, und es ist gerade als könne man eine Messe machen. So der G. H. von Schubert, der erbarmliche, mit seinem hübschen Talent, hübschen aperçus usw. spielt nun mit dem Tode, sucht sein Heil in der Verwesung, da er freilich selbst schon halb verwest ist, und das heißt, buchstäblich die Schwindsucht hat. Da mochte man des Teufels werden, es ist aber gut, ich lasse sie machen, es geht zugrunde, und das ist recht."

Nehmen wir dazu die Äußerung Goethes am vorhergehenden Tage, so fällt ein klareres Licht auf den Nachtseiter: "Alles ist Metamorphose im Leben, bei den Pflanzen, bei den Tieren, bis zum Menschen und bei diesem auch. Je vollkommener, je weniger die Fähigkeit, aus einer Form in die andere überzugehen.—Ach Gott!

² Siehe Biedermann. *Goethes Gespräche* (1909²) Bd. II unter 1132, 1144, 1165, 1686

³ *Nachtseite* 324, der Goetheforschung wenig bekannt, sodaß Biedermann im Index sogar Schubert mit einem Fragezeichen versieht.

es ist so einfach und immer dasselbe, es ist wahrhaftig keine Kunst, unser Herr Gott zu sein, es gehört nur ein einziger Gedanke dazu, wenn die Schöpfung da ist. Was vorher war, das geht mich nichts an." Was vorher war und was nachher sein wird, geht indessen Schubert sehr viel an, denn sein Buch sucht zu zeigen, daß der Mensch ursprünglich in viel engerer Verbindung mit dem Göttlichen gestanden, daß in der Tradition menschlichen Wissens noch Rudimente einer einstigen göttlichen Weisheit ahnungsreich fortleben, und daß dem Menschengeschlecht "jene heilige Unschuld und hohe Vollendung aller Kräfte wiederkehren, welche es am Anfang seiner Geschichte verherrlichte, und jene glückliche Nachwelt sich das durch ihr eigenes hohes Streben wieder erringen wird, was der Vorwelt ohne ihr Verdienst, von der Natur gegeben war" (S. 384).

In diesem Sinne hatte Schubert bereits in der *Nachtseite* das Goethische *Marchen* gedeutet. Noch liegt "der ewige Tempel jenseits des großen Stromes, welcher das Irdische von dem Überirdischen, die Welt des Materiellen von der Geisterwelt trennt, . . . noch pflegt die tiefe ewige Liebe in uns, jenes unsterbliche Sehnen, unter dem Bild der schönen Lilie, nur zu toten, was sie ergriffen, sie, welche doch alles Leben aus dem Schoos der ewigen Nacht hervorgerufen. Aber siehe, schon ward die Stimme im Tempel vernommen, es ist an der Zeit. Die schöne grüne Schlange—das klare Selbstbewußtseyn, die Reflexion, jene, welche einst den Geist des Menschen von der Unschuld der ersten Kindheit herabgezogen, ist in der Wechselwirkung mit der Außenwelt, und durch den edlen Egoismus, der nur, wo er ausartet, als Eigennutz erscheint, immer klarer und sich selber durchsichtiger geworden" ⁴. Aber wenn die beiden Welten im innern Wesen sich vereinen und die Brücke gebaut ist, "wenn die bloße Reflexion in der Zeit ihrer schönsten Blüthe in den Händen der Lilie sich selber aufopfern wird, wenn jene tief im Innern liegende ewige Liebe aus dem Daseyn des Menschen hervortreten, und das irdische Streben verzehren wird, dann erwacht der schöne Jüngling wieder und wird herrschen. . . . Als dann erst, werden die besseren Genien unsres Geschlechts, welche die frühere Welt beherrscht, wieder in dem alten Glanze hervortreten."

. 'Man beachte übrigens die eigenartigen Anklänge Schuberts an K. Ph. Moritz' von Goethe hochgeschätzten Aufsatz *Über die bildende Nachahmung des Schönen*, der im *Teutschen Merkur* 1789 erschien und von Seuffert herausgegeben wurde als DLD 31.

Es ist durch das ganze Buch Schuberts hindurch schwer, genau festzustellen, ob die Lauterung erst im Augenblicke des physischen Todes vor sich gehen wird, und wie weit sie individuell, wie weit als Entwicklung der Menschheit aufzufassen ist. Aber offenbar fühlte sich Goethe durch den seit der *Nachtseite* und den ersten Banden der *Ahndungen* immer mehr ins Religiöse abgleitenden Mystizismus Schuberts abgestoßen. So ist es nicht unmöglich, daß gerade aus diesem Ressentiment die Schlußstrophe von "Selige Sehnsucht" hervorgegangen wäre, die, wie Burdach meint, etwas unvermutet einen durchaus neuen und spezifisch Goethischen Gedanken bringe, nämlich den der "körperlich-geistigen, sinnlich-sittlichen Metamorphose des irdischen Menschen, die Idee der natürlich ansteigenden Entwicklung vermöge eines äußeren und inneren Stoffwechsels des Menschen, in dem sich fortgesetzt eine Steigerung und Entpuppung seiner eigentlichen Anlage vollzieht." Die Brücke zwischen beiden Ideen, von der Burdach spricht, zwischen der diesseitigen und der jenseitigen, daß sich nämlich die Metamorphose über den Abschluß der empirischen Existenz des Menschen fortsetze in einer übersinnlichen, nur der Ahnung zugänglichen Welt, ist ja bei Schubert bereits gegeben. So wurde dann aus dem ursprünglich von Goethe in der Handschrift des Gedichtes von 1815 gewählten Titel "Selbstopfer" im Druck des *Taschenbuches für Damen auf das Jahr 1817* nach Zusatz der fünften Strophe der Titel "Vollendung."

"Selbstopfer" stimmt übrigens noch durchaus zu Goethes "schöner, grüner Schlange" im *Marchen*, die "sich aufopfernd ehe sie geopfert wird" in tausend Edelsteine zerfällt, aus denen die Brücke entsteht, "wodurch diese nachbarlichen Ufer erst zu Landern belebt und verbunden werden," stimmt zugleich aber auch zu Selbstopfer und Vollendung der Schlange in Schuberts Deutung: sie ist "das klare Selbstbewußtsein, die Reflexion, jene, welche einst den Geist des Menschen von der Unschuld der ersten Kindheit herabgezogen . . . in der Wechselwirkung mit der Außenwelt [Stoffwechsel!] . . . immer klarer und sich selber durchsichtiger" wird und einst "sich selber aufopfernd" als Brücke die "beyden Welten tief im innern Wesen . . . vereinen" wird.

Nachweisbar ist indessen die Anregung Goethes durch Schubert nicht. Ob die Berührung ihrer Ideen in Schelling zu suchen ist, ob Schubert sich in die Goethische Art zu denken, so tief als ihm

möglich, hineingelebt hat, daß er eine Idee in dessen Weise fortentwickeln konnte, muß dahin gestellt bleiben. Merkwürdig wäre es, wenn Goethe auf diesem Umwege sein eignes Gut zurückgenommen hatte. Jedenfalls wäre, für die Zeit der *Nachtseite*, Goethes Ausbruch über Schubert noch nicht ganz berechtigt, denn wir finden in diesem Buche kurz vor der Deutung des *Marchens* eine so durchaus Goethisch gedachte *Maxime* wie diese. "Nicht ein Verachten des irdischen Tagewerks und ein unthatiges unsrer Natur nicht ziemendes Schmachten nach dem Höheren, nicht die allzueinseitig nach innen gerichtete Beschauung, ruft jenes achte hohe Sehnen, jenes Streben, welches über die Grenzen der Zeit hinausgeht, in dem Gemüth hervor, vielmehr wird dieses nur in einem frohlichen Fordern des jetzigen Tagewerks gefunden" (S. 322).

ERNST FEISE

HANGEMATTE

The words for *hammock* in the various European languages (Span. *hamaca*, Ital. *amaca*, Port. *maca*, French *hamac*, Engl. *hammock*, Dutch *hangmak*, *hangmat*, German *Hangematte*) all trace their origin back to a Carribean *hamáca*.¹ Dictionaries that treat the word historically² all cite as the earliest instance outside the Romance languages the one given in the *NED.*, from Eden's *Decades*, a book translated in 1555. "Theyr hangynge beddes which they caule *Hamacas*." For German, Kluge-Götze cites as the earliest instance the form *Hengmatten*, from a text of the year 1627, but is unable to cite an instance of *hamaca*. This can now be shown in Nikolaus Federmann's contemporary account of his travels in Vene-

¹ Kluge-Götze states (p. 231) "Karib *hamáca* bez die schwebenden Schlaf- und Tragnetze der Kariben, die schon Kolumbus unter diesem Namen kennen lernte," but I find in the account of Columbus' Second Voyage (*Letters of Columbus* Transl. by R. H. Major, London, 1847) merely the word *cama*, 'bed' "hallámosle echado en su cama, como ellos lo usan, colgado en el aire," translated by Major as: "we find him stretched upon his bed, which was made of cotton net-work, and, according to their custom, suspended" (p. 54f.).

² E. g. Kluge, *Seemannssprache*, 1911, p. 353; *Woordenboek der nederl taal*, by de Vries and others, v, 2029

zuela in the years 1529-1531, easily accessible in volume 47 of the *Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart*, 1858.³

In the years 1529-1531 Nikolaus Federmann, a citizen of Ulm,⁴ travelled extensively in Venezuela as the representative of the banking house of the Welsers in Augsburg, to whom the Emperor Charles V had pledged this district as security for a loan. For a time, Federmann was Viceroy of Venezuela, and the chief aim of his expeditions was to discover gold. Detailed notes and descriptions, in Spanish, of the places and peoples visited, were made by him on the spot, and from these notes, authenticated by a Spanish notary in his retinue, the official report to the Spanish government was compiled. Immediately after his return to Europe in 1532, he drew up his German account, with which we are more particularly concerned. Of the writing of his account he himself says (p. 80)

Auß disem flecken schicket ich einen Christen gab ihme eben dise Relation, zeittung und bericht diser raiß und unsers außrichtens, welches alles von einem offnen Notario Scribano publico, so auch in diser raiß mit gezogen, annotirt, und was sich von einem flecken in andern begeben, verzeichnet hatt Dann solches alles zu thun, und Kay May von allem und yedent, das in den Indios wirt außgericht, glaubwürdigen bericht zugeben, ist in allen Indianischen landen Ihrer Kay May bevelch und ordnung, das habe ich hiemit, doch auffs kürzest nach dem buchstaben verteutscht, und doch darneben etwa mit umbstenden ettlicher dinger, mer zu declariern mit umbgen kunden, dann auch solche Relation inn Hispanischer sprach, an ort geschriben, da die sitten und vil tail der art und gebrauch der Indianischen lander wol bewußt ist, und derhalben, wa in disem tranßlado so kurtz und gantz nach dem buchstaben darvon were geschriben, oder der Hispanischen sprach nachgefolget, were es gantz unverstentlich

I have reproduced this extract in order to assure the reader that we have to do with a first-hand, authoritative, and contemporary account. The word *Hamaco*, *Hamaca* occurs in three places:

erhöbe ich mich . . . ließ etliche der krancken in Hamacos, also heissen die Indianische beth, dern art ich hernach ahnzaigen wil, tragen, darzu ich die Indios unsers droß gebrauchet, und den innwonern züverstehen gabe, darumb sie groß herren weren, wurden sie getragen (p. 40), Am andern

³ *N. Federmanns und H. Stades Reisen in Sudamerica 1529 bis 1555*, hrsg. von Dr. Karl Klüpfel. This title is somewhat misleading, as the two men had nothing to do with each other. Federmann was in South America in 1529-1531, Stade in 1547-1555, after Federmann's death.

⁴ Cf. the account in the *Allg. deu. Biographie*, VI, 598.

tag morgens, kam ein Indio und etwann bei viertzig personen mit ihm, der hieß sich, als ob er der herr oder Cacique were des fleckens in ainer Hamaca tragen, wir hielten men auch fur den Cacique oder herren Ich ließ mit ihm reden seine behausung wider einzunemen, gab ihm die gefangne zwei weiber wider Nun aber dise nacht uns unwisent, erhub er sich mit allem seinem volck darvon, und ließ die Hamaca darinnen man ihn getragen, im hauß hangen, also daß wir morgens nicht einen menschen funden, Darab wir nemen khunten, das diser nicht der Cacique oder herr, sonder ettwann nur ein schlechter Indio oder Schlavo (p 69)

The exact date of Federmann's death is unknown he had died before Nov. 28, 1543, as shown by an entry in the records of Ulm, his German account, under the title *Indianische Historia*, was first published by his brother-in-law and heir, Hans Kiefhaber, in 1557.

The word *Hamaca* did not develop in the German language of the sixteenth century, probably because Federmann's book was little read.

In the seventeenth century the development from *amaka*, *hamaka* to *hang-makka*, *hangmatte* can be followed very prettily in the Dutch book on *America* by Montanus,⁵ Amsterdam, 1671, as also in the German translation by Olfert Dapper⁶ in 1673.

Montanus' book has nothing original about it: it is a compilation of extracts from the works of a dozen or more authors of his own and of the previous century—Spanish, Portuguese, French, Latin, English, and German (for example, Federmann is also cited). Most of the space is devoted to Central and South America. There was accordingly abundant opportunity to take over Spanish and Portuguese words for *hammock*. Some of these passed over unchanged into the German text of Dapper, others were modified or paraphrased:

⁵ *De Nieuwe en Onbekende Weereld: of Beschryving van America en 't Zuidland* . . . Door Arnoldus Montanus, Amsterdam, 1671 4 leaves, 585 pp, 13 leaves in folio, with numerous illustrations The *Privilegie* is dated July 28, 1670. Copy in Princeton University Library

⁶ *Die Unbekante Neue Welt/oder Beschreibung des Welt-teils Amerika, und des Süd-Landes* . . . Durch Dr O D Amsterdam, 1673 4 leaves, 658 pp, 11 leaves, folio, with the same illustrations as in Montanus The imperial *Privilegium*, dated August 9, 1670, refers to the fact that the book is "von Doctr Dapper in Niederlandischer Sprach beschrieben. Nunmehr aber in die Hochteutsche übergesetzt worden" If this statement is true, Montanus' name does not belong on the title-page of the Dutch edition. Copy of Dapper in my possession. Brief biographies of both Montanus and Dapper in Jöcher's *Gelahrten-Lexikon*.

De vermoogenste gebruiken kotoene amakken in plaets van bedden (Montanus 180^a) Die Reichen haben Baumwollene Decken, welke sie Amakken nennen, an Bettesstat (Dapper 203^b)

Thans biedenze tot rust een zuivere kotoene amak aen (Montanus (181^b) Hierauf nohtigen sie ihren Gast auf einen reinen Baumwollenen Hangebette, welches sie Amacke nennen, seine ruhe zu nehmen (Dapper 205^a).

steeken onder geboomt vier stijlen in d' aerde, aen welke d' ammakken binden ten nacht-rust (Montanus 182^a) schlagen unter den Beumen vier Pfahle in die Erde, daran sie ihre Hangebetten binden, ihre Nachtruhe zu nehmen (Dapper 206^a)

Haer meeste huisraad zijn kotoene hamakken, aerdig gevlochten, waer op by daeg luyeren en 's nachts slaepen (Montanus 451^a) Ihr Meister und vornahmster Hausraht seynd sehr ahrtig geflochtene Baumwollene Hangematten, darauf sie des Tages zu faullentzen, und des Nachtes zu schlafen pflegen (Dapper 508^a)

alwaer kotoene hamakken, in 't vierkant stijf gespannen, ten nacht-rust staen (Montanus 545^b) da sie ihre Hamakken oder Hangematten, aus Baumwolle gemacht, und viereckicht ausgespannet, zur Nachtruhe stehen haben (Dapper 613^a)

leggen hem neder in een zijde hang-mak, tusschen twee boomen uitgespannen (Montanus 58^a) legen ihn in ein hangendes Netze, mit den enden zwischen zwee beumen ausgespannet (Dapper 62^b)

in hang-makken, aen twee stijlen vast gemaect by nacht stookenze vuur onder d' hang-makken (Montanus 57^b) in Baumwollenen Netzen, welche zwischen zwo seulen, daran sie mit den enden fest seind, hangen In solchen hangenden und in der Luft schwebenden Betten. . Hierunter machen sie des nachts ein gelindes Feuer (Dapper 61^b) the index, in referring to this passage has *Hangematten*

slaepen op gebreyde hang-makken, tusschen twee stijlen vast-geknoot: nevens de hang-makken brand gestaedig vuur (Montanus 364^b) Sie schlafen auf gestrückten Hange-matten, welche sie mit den enden an zwo Seulen fest geknüpft Neben den Hänge-matten brennet fort und fort Feuer (Dapper 410^b).

slaepen op gebreyde hangmatten (Montanus 480^b) schlafen auf gestrackten Hangematten (Dapper 542^b)

kotoen, waer uit lywaed en hang-bedden toegesteld . . . worden (Montanus 166^b) Baumwolle, daraus vielerhand Tucher gewebet, Hange-betten gemacht werden (Dapper 187^b)

nevens haer hang-bedden, des nachts vuur stookten (Montanus 360^a): bey ihren Hangebetten des Nachtes ein Feuer anzulegen (Dapper 405^b).

welken *Rembach* in een hang-bedde na 't *Real* liet voeren (Montanus 435^b): den *Rembach*, in einem Hangebette nach Real führen lies (Dapper 490^a)

de man houd op een hang-bedde den kraem uit (Montanus 545^b) der Man lieget indessen auf einem Hangebette, und halt die sechs Wochen aus (Dapper 613^b)

so bald ein Spanier nur etwas ermüdet, trugen sie ihn, in ihren Baum-

wollenen hangenetzen, mit großer sorgfältigkeit (Dapper 64^a) (Apparently no exact counterpart in Montanus)

In the Dutch text we find the forms *amak*, *amakken*, *hamakken*, *hang-mak*, *hang-makken*, *hangmatten*, and *hang-bedden*. Most important of these is *hang-mak*, which leads to *hang-mat* and *hang-bed*, particularly as the idea of hanging suspended came in also from the context. The *Woordenboek* does not know the earliest forms *amak*, *amakken*, and *hamakken*, and is able to cite only one instance of *hangmak*, from a text of 1671, the same year in which Montanus' book appeared.

In Dapper's German text we have *Amacke*, *Amacken*, *Hamacken*, *Hangematten*, *Hangebette*, *Hangebette*, *Hangnetz*, and *Netze*. The *DWb.* does not record *Amacke*, *Hamacke*, and *Hängenetz*. *Hangmatte* is recorded for the year 1712, and *Hangebette* for 1781; *Hangebett* is cited from Jean Paul, who uses it jestingly for the gallows. Kluge, *Seemannssprache* 353, under *Hangematten*, records an American word *inni* for hammock, from Städe's *Reise in Sudamerika*, but he fails to notice the instances of *Hamaco*, *Hamaca* in Federmann's text, published in the same volume.

W. KURRELMAYER

DER BEGRIFF "DEUTSCHLAND" IM WÖRTERBUCH DES DASYPODIUS

Zuschriften wohlwollender Leser meines Aufsatzes über das Wörterbuch des Dasypodius¹ haben mir gezeigt, daß ich an einer Stelle zu lakonisch gewesen bin. Es handelt sich um die Anmerkung 7 auf Seite 293, wo ich auf die plurale Form des Satzes *Germania* = *das ganz Teutschland so weit die Teutsche spraach gehnt* hingewiesen habe. Nicht nur *gehnt* ist = *sie gehen*. *Spraak* gehört zur german. *ô*-Deklination und bildet seinen Plural ursprünglich ohne konsonantische Endung (ahd. *-â*, mhd. *-ê*).² DW. 10, 1, 2718 verzeichnet für des Frühnhd. "ganz vereinzelt den Plural *sprach*" und belegt ihn aus dem hessischen Wörterbuch des Erasmus Alberus

¹ "Das Werden der Gemeinsprache im Wörterbuch des Dasypodius," *Germanic Review*, XVIII (1943), 286-303

² Vgl. Paul-Gierach, *Mhd. Grammatik* (Halle 1929) § 125; O. Mausser, *Mhd. Grammatik* (München 1933), 642; V. Moser, *Einführung in die frühnhd. Schriftsprache* (Halle 1909) § 138

(1540), der hier wie so oft von Dasypodius abhängig ist. Wer sich an dem stark deklinierten Adjektiv stößt, sei auf Behaghel, *Deutsche Syntax* I (Heidelberg 1923) § 120—besonders Seite 187 f—verwiesen, derzufolge "die starke Form nach bestimmtem Artikel im Nom., Akk. Plur. im Fruhnhd. geradezu eine alemannische Besonderheit ist." Die Bedeutung *weit reichen* für *gehen* endlich ist DW. 4, 1, 2434 unter Ziffer II, 18, h befriedigend bezeugt.

Somit ist die Meinung der Dasypodius-Glosse *Germania· das ganze Deutschland, so weit die deutschen Sprachen reichen.*³

Die Einführung der Sprachgrenze zur Bestimmung deutschen Territoriums geht nicht auf Dasypodius zurück sondern ist in dieser Zeit ganz allgemein. Sebastian Francks *Denn Teutsch landt oder Germania wirt yetzt so weit gerechnet, so weit Teutsch zung, sie sei güt odder böss, weret vnd geredt wurt . . .* oder an anderer Stelle: *Nun ist das gewiß, das Germania Teutschlandt sich allweg so weit hat erstreckt, so weit teutsch zung ist gangen*⁴ konnte direkt dem Dasypodius entnommen sein, da es sich nicht, wie die unmittelbar vorhergehenden Satze, bei Francks Gewährsmann Rhenanus findet, aber auch Sebastian Munster (*Cosmographia*, Basel 1544, Bl. 95), Hieronymus Cock (1565), Franciscus Irenicus (*Totius Germaniae Descriptio*, Frankfurt 1570), Abraham Ortelius (1572) und andere Autoren der Zeit begreifen die Sprachgrenze als die *natürliche* Grenze deutschen Landes.

Alle diese Parallelen sind junger als die Dasypodius-Glosse, die aber dennoch nicht als original gelten kann. Schon in Johann Bohme, *Repertorium librorum trium*, Augsburg 1520, heißt es auf Blatt 72: *... ex quo hodie et consequenter etiam non montes non flumina pro regionum terminis habentur, sed singulae linguae et*

³ Nach einer freundlichen Auskunft W. Kurrelmeyers heißt es in der ihm gehörigen Ausgabe des Dasypodius. *Germania, Das gantz Teutschland / so weit die Teutsche spraach gehet. Sic enim hodie censetur* Der Drucker dieses *Dasypodius* ist nicht mehr Wendelin Rihel sondern dessen Sohn Theodosius, der ohne Jahreszahl erschienene Band ist später als 1560. Wendelin hatte zwei Söhne und Erben, Josias und Theodosius, beide Drucker, beide Neuverleger des beliebten Wörterbuchs. Die Wendung zum Singular, so wenig sie Dasypodius selbst zuzuschreiben ist, zeigt in schonem Licht den Fortschritt zur "Einheitsprache" in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts.

Ich möchte noch hinzufügen, daß der Druck, den Theodosius veranstaltet hat, selten ist, mir ist nur ein Exemplar der Leipziger UB bekannt geworden.

⁴ Das erste Zitat aus *Germaniae Chronicon*, 1538, Bl. 2, das andere aus dem Angsburger Druck *Chronica der Teutschen*, 1538/39, Bl. 76.

impera. Eousque unamquamque regionem extendi dicant, quousque gentis illius sermo versatur Daß aber auch Bohme nicht etwa der Erfinder des neuen Gedankens ist, zeigt eine Stelle in Gobelinus Persons *Cosmidromius* von 1418, wo er schreibt: *Unde antiqui considerabant divisiones provinciarum secundum limites et terminos fluminum montium et silvarum ac marium, sed vulgares moderni attendunt tales distinctiones secundum differencias idiomatum*⁵ Damit wird uns die Richtung gewiesen, in der wir die Herkunft der Idee der Sprachgrenze zu suchen haben. Der Früh-Humanismus findet in der Volkssprache einen Zeugen für seine nationalen Ansprüche. Das gilt ebenso für die italienische, auf Dante bzw. Flavio Biondo zurückgreifende Spielart, wie für die niederländische, wo die in der IJsselgegend entstandene Bewegung der Bruder vom Gemeinsamen Leben in ihre Volksschulen den Unterricht in der Muttersprache einführt. Mit Nicolaus Cusanus, den Gobelin Person sicherlich gekannt hat, entsendet diese früh-nationale Bewegung ihren Wortführer an den Oberrhein.⁶ Somit steht schon Wimpfeling in ehrwürdiger Tradition, wenn er in die territorialen Streitigkeiten des deutschen Sudwestens den Begriff der Sprachgrenze einführt. Unter den Argumenten, die Wimpfeling 1501/02 sammelt, um den Franzosen das Recht auf das Elsaß abzusprechen, findet sich der "moderne" Schluß, das Elsaß sei deutsch, *antiquitas nominum Teutonicorum id testatur (Declaratio ad mitigandum adversarium)*.

In der damaligen Polemik spiegelt sich die Gleichung von *natio* und *Zunge* wider, die für das ganze Mittelalter gilt. Mit *deutsch* werden die deutschsprachigen Reichsgebiete von welschen und slavischen abgesondert; die Urkunden der Zeit reden von dem *Roemischen Reich und sonderlich den deutschen Landen*, was manchmal auch durch *deutsche Nation* oder *die deutschen Zungen* wiedergegeben wird, ohne daß sich daraus etwa so weitgehende Schlüsse ziehen liessen wie neuerdings A. Diehl will.⁷ Die Sprache zum Schieds-

⁵ Die Zitate, mit Ausnahme der von Sebastian Franck, sind entnommen E. Meynen, *Deutschland und Deutsches Reich. Sprachgebrauch und Begriffswesenheit des Wortes Deutschland* (Leipzig 1935)

⁶ Hierzu neben J. Huizinga, *Holländische Kultur des 17. Jh.* (Jena 1937) vor allem E. Hoffmann "Die Anfänge der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben und die flämische Mystik" *Jahrbuch d. Arbeitsgemeinschaft d. rhein. Geschichtsvereine* 1936, 106 ff.

⁷ A. Diehl "Heiliges römisches Reich deutscher Nation" *Historische Zeitschrift* —, 156 (1937), 457 ff.

richter in politischen Fragen aufzurufen, die natürlichen Grenzen von Flußlauf und Hohenzügen mit dem Hinweis auf sie abzutun, das ist gewiß erst dem Humanismus eingefallen. Man darf daher so weit gehen wie A. Schmitt in einem sehr weit gefassten Satz: Den Ausgangspunkt, von dem aus man zur Erfassung der Einheit des Volkes gelangte, hatte für die Franzosen die Einheit des Staates gebildet, für die Deutschen war es die Einheit der Sprache,⁸ wenn man sich nur sofort vergegenwärtigt, daß von *Einheit* der Sprache nicht eigentlich die Rede sein kann. Das grade zeigt ja die pluralische Wendung der Dasypodius-Glosse so deutlich.⁹

Ihre Bedeutung liegt aber noch wo anders. Im Jahre 1535 ist doch die Anerkennung der Sprachgrenze im Munde eines Schweizers nicht selbstverständlich! Mehr als ein Menschenalter nach dem Schwabenkrieg und dem Frieden von Basel (1499), in dem die Loslösung der Eidgenossen vom Reich politische Tatsache wird, scheint der Frauenfelder Lexikograph seine Heimat Deutschland zuzurechnen. Natürlich läßt dieses Bekenntnis als eines zur Sprachgemeinschaft keine politischen Schlüsse zu. Was die Dasypodius-Glosse grade beweist, ist die Tatsache, daß Deutschland immer weiter auch im 16. Jahrhundert ein im wesentlichen linguistischer Begriff ist. Es ist daher völlig verfehlt, wenn Meynen a. a. o. 15 betont, "daß die Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft auch nach ihrem Ausscheiden aus dem Reichsverband als Teil Deutschlands gegolten hat," so lange man nicht hinzufügt, daß Deutschland noch gar kein politischer Begriff war. Das wird klar durch die berühmte, noch in das 18. Jahrhundert hineinreichende offizielle Bezeichnung der Schweiz als *Alter grosser Bund in oberdeutschen Landen*, wobei *Bund* politische Meinung hat und *oberdeutsche Lande* sprachgeographische.

Dieser Wortsinn liegt schon dem *Germania*-Lemma des alten Dasypodius zugrunde.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

Kenyon College

⁸ A. Schmitt "Völker, Staaten und Sprachen in der europäischen Geschichte" *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissen u. Jugendbildung*. 1935, I, 60 f.

⁹ Noch im *Simplicissimus* ist das Gefühl dafür deutlich, wenn die Rede ist von *Leuthen* die zwar nur ihrer Muttersprache können, sich aber einbilden, sie sei die schönste und beste aller Sprachen des ganzen Teutschlands. Auf die schöne Stelle hat neulich L. Spitzer in *MDU xxxvi* (1944), 127 Anm. 22 hingewiesen.

KNOWLEDGE OF HROTSVITHA'S WORKS PRIOR TO 1500

The statement that Hrotsvitha and her works fell into practically complete oblivion after her death about 1000 and did not become known again until 1493, when Conrad Celtes (or Johann Trithem)¹ discovered the Emmeram-Munich codex in Regensburg, has been repeated so often that it is now axiomatic. One need not go far into the Hrotsvitha literature, which has grown to sizable proportions—over seventy titles—since Charles Magnin's *Le Théâtre de Hrotsvitha* (Paris, 1845), to find this statement. Rudolf Wolkan reiterates it in *Das deutsche Drama*,² and so does Helene Homeyer in *Roswitha von Gandersheim, Werke*.³ The question whether or not this allegation be literally true is of more than academic significance, because upon its answer hinges the solution of the further question of Hrotsvitha's position as a possible factor during five hundred years of important literary development. If it were not true, then it would behoove scholars to search the literature and art of that period for evidence of her influence upon the religious legend, the historical chronicle in verse, and, what is still more important, upon the drama. This has not been done with a sufficient degree of adequacy precisely because scholars have been too prone to believe the assertions of Hrotsvitha's eclipse.

The following points call attention to evidence which tends to show that Hrotsvitha and her works were not quite as unknown from 1000 to 1500 as we are sometimes led to believe. They purposely pass over the years between 1493 and 1501, while Celtes was

¹ Most critics today trust Celtes' claims to the honor, repeated in many of his letters between 1493 and 1501 (*Der Briefwechsel des Konrad Celtes. Gesammelt, herausgegeben und erläutert von Hans Rupprich. München, 1934*), and in the title of his folio edition: *Opera Hrosvite . . . nuper a Conrado Celte inventa* (Nürnberg, 1501). It is a fact that the codex was loaned to him by Prior Archer of the Emmeram monastery. Cf. Engelbert Klüpfel, *De Vita et Scriptis Conradi Celtis Protucor*, II, Freiburg, 1827, p. 78. On the other hand, Otto Schmid in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, XXIX, 285 f., suggests that Trithem may have been the actual discoverer, who turned the matter over to Celtes. Trithem's discussion of Hrotsvitha in his *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, Basel, 1494, antedates the references of Celtes.

² Edited by Robert F. Arnold, München, 1925, p. 109 ff.

³ Paderborn, 1936.

at work upon his edition, because during that time no one doubts that Hrotsvitha became well known among Celtes' many friends.

1 In his *Scriptores rerum Brunsvicensium illustrationi inservientes*⁴ G. W. Leibniz quotes, from the eleventh-century *Chronica Episcopatus Hildeshemensis et Abbatiae Monasterii S. Michelis*, a reference to Hrotsvitha as the author of a poem on the lives of the three Ottos (936-1002), emperors of the Holy Roman Empire. Incidentally, if this is correct, her poem *De Gestis Oddonis I, Imperatoris*, as now preserved in the Emmeram-Munich codex, is incomplete.

2. That the Emmeram-Munich codex of Hrotsvitha was not the only one known in the Middle Ages is now apparent. The *Opera Hrosvite virginis monialis* mentioned in the catalog of the monastery of Altzelle in 1514 and now lost, was probably one of the copies of that codex.⁵ The Klagenfurt fragments of the legend *Maria* and the drama *Sapientia*,⁶ dating from the eleventh century, represent a manuscript probably copied from the same codex and taken to Vienna considerably before 1513. There may have been other copies elsewhere. Besides, there must have been another group of manuscripts of the first four plays, quite independent of the Emmeram-Munich codex. One, the Cologne codex, was found in 1922,⁷ and others may still turn up. This group seems to have consisted of copies made prior to the writing of the Emmeram-Munich codex for distribution to Hrotsvitha's several patrons whom in her letter of dedication, prefaced to the complete dramas, she calls "sapientes huius libri fautores." There may, then, have been extant, in key monasteries throughout Central Europe from Cologne to Vienna, at least half a dozen apographs of four or more of Hrotsvitha's plays and several copies of her legends and of the poem on Otto.

3. About the middle of the twelfth century, shortly after the accession of the Hohenstaufens, the Aldersbach Passional originated. It contains Hrotsvitha's first drama, *Gallicanus*, without her name. The play was apparently copied from the Emmeram-

⁴ Leipzig and Hannover, II, 1710, p. 787 f

⁵ Cf. *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte*, XVIII, 251, and *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XXIV, 771

⁶ Cf. H. Menhardt in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, LXII, 233-236

⁷ The discoverer was Goswin Franken. Cf. *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XLIV, 101-114

Munich codex, or from another manuscript available at the time. This was discovered by Paul von Winterfeld in 1902.⁸ It developed that this is not the only instance of the use of *Gallhannus* in such collective works, for it also appears in other writings of Austro-Bavarian legendry.⁹

4. The situation with regard to the *Primordia Coenobii Gandeshemensis*, not in the codex and at no time a part of it, is somewhat different. But here, too, there is indication of some survival of Hrotsvitha's memory after the tenth century. After reposing in Gandersheim for two hundred years the manuscript was translated into German early in the thirteenth century by a certain Eberhard, whose rhymed chronicle of Gandersheim is now available.¹⁰ In the fifteenth century a copy of the original manuscript was made, this copy was discovered by J. G. Leuckfeld and published in his *Antiquitates Gandeshemenses* (1709). In the sixteenth century the monk Bodo of the monastery of Clus took the manuscript with him and lost it.¹¹ A copy of another apparently very old manuscript, independent of the aforementioned fifteenth-century transcript, was found in Coburg in 1843.¹² In addition, seventeen lines of the poem have been preserved separately in the *Annales Paderbornenses*.¹³

5. It has been claimed by a Russian scholar, Boris I. Jarcho, who has devoted many years to Hrotsvitha research, that certain striking verbal parallels between Hrotsvitha's dramas and the *Vita Mahthildis Reginae II* point to Hrotsvitha's influence upon the *Vita*.¹⁴ This, if true, is extremely significant.

Under these circumstances, then, it is not altogether out of the question that other evidence of knowledge of Hrotsvitha and her works between 1000 and 1500 may yet turn up. And perhaps

⁸ *Hrotsvithae Opera*. Recensuit et emendavit Paulus de Winterfeld, Berlin, 1902, p. 1v.

⁹ Cf. Karl Strecker in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, XI, 629 f.

¹⁰ *Eberhards Reimchronik von Gandersheim*. Herausgegeben von L. Weiland. Chroniken und andere Geschichtsbücher des Mittelalters, 2 Band, Hannover, 1877.

¹¹ K. A. Barack, *Die Werke der Hrotsvitha*, Nurnberg, 1858, p. LVIII.

¹² *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, VIII, 266

¹³ Edited by Nikolaus Schaten, I, 1893, p. 128. Reprinted with a third part in 1774-1775.

¹⁴ *Speculum*, II, 343 f.

patient research may still reveal a link between Hrotsvitha's dramas and the miracle plays, written as they were by monks, clerics, and other persons connected with the monasteries, who may have known Hrotsvitha's dramas¹⁵ In such a happy event, other connections between Hrotsvitha and the literature and art of the centuries immediately following the tenth may be revealed, and the writings that have been called the sidetracked work of an insignificant recluse, who allegedly left no trace of influence upon posterity and who has been treated as though she had been a humanist born five hundred years too soon, may yet assume new significance.

EDWIN H ZEYDEL

University of Cincinnati

DIE QUELLE VON HOFMANNSTHALS *FRAU OHNE SCHATTEN*

Hofmannsthal fühlt sich so stark als Erbe der Tradition, daß er vorzieht, die Verwicklungen seiner Dramen statt auf eigene Erfindungen auf schon einmal geschehene oder geformte Handlungen zu gründen. So folgen das *Bergwerk zu Falun*, *Orstinas Heimreise*, das *Gerettete Venedig*, die griechischen und die katholischen Dramen bis zum *Turm* und der *Ägyptischen Helena* einem vorgeformten Stoff. Daß aber auch des Dichters Hauptwerk, die Erzählung *Die Frau ohne Schatten*, auf eine einzelne Quelle zurückgeführt werden kann, ist weniger bekannt. In der *Frau ohne Schatten* sind nicht nur, wie Naef sagt,¹ "kaum eine Gestalt, kaum ein Motiv, die nicht dort (*scil.* in Tausendundeiner Nacht) ihre Analogie, ja ihr Vorbild und ihre Urheimat hatten," sondern die Verbindung der wichtigsten, von Hofmannsthal verwendeten Fäden der Handlung findet sich in einer einzigen Geschichte von Tausendundeiner Nacht, der Geschichte von dem Fischer und dem Geist, in der sechsten bis neunten Nacht in Greve's Fassung der

¹⁵ G. R. Coffman, in his article "A New Approach to Medieval Latin Drama," in *Modern Philology*, xxii, 263 f., has already suggested that there may be a relationship. Von Winterfeld (xvi ff) is convinced that Hrotsvitha wrote sequences.

¹ Karl J. Naef, *Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Wesen und Werk* (Zurich und Leipzig: Max Niehans, 1938), 179.

Übersetzung von Burton, die 1907 mit Hofmannsthals Einleitung zuerst veröffentlicht wurde.²

Die folgenden Übereinstimmungen sind meines Erachtens beweisend, daß dem Dichter der *Frau ohne Schatten* das orientalische Märchen wie ein Kern seiner Vorstellungen und Bilder gegenwärtig gewesen sein muß. Der Schauplatz der Hofmannsthalschen Erzählung wechselt zwischen einer volkreichen östlichen Stadt und einem oden Hochgebirge, den "Mondbergen". Derselbe Wechsel findet in dem alten Märchen statt, aber die Verzauberung der Stadt in eine Bergwildnis und ihre Rück-Erlösung stellt dort eine Einheit des Schauplatzes her, die wir bei Hofmannsthal nicht mehr verstehen. Die Hauptgestalt ist in beiden Geschichten eine Fürstin, die mit höheren Mächten in Verbindung steht, eine Zauberin, eine Feentochter, und die sich trotzdem dem niedrigsten Menschen zum Dienst hingibt. Ihr Gatte steht unter einem Fluch, der ihn zu Stein erstarren läßt, und von dem er durch die Tat eines anderen erlost wird. Bei der Verwandlung der rein stofflichen Vorgänge des alten Märchens in eine sittliche Welt hat Hofmannsthal diese Tat der Erlösung zu dem einen Leitgedanken gemacht, während wir das zweite Hauptmotiv Hofmannsthals, das der Kindschaft, ebenfalls, wenn auch nur angedeutet, in der alten Erzählung finden. Der fremde König nimmt den Prinzen, den er erlost hat, an Sohnes Statt an. Einzelne Züge, die noch fernerhin die beiden Geschichten verbinden, sind: die singenden Fische in der Bratpfanne; die körperliche Ähnlichkeit der Gestalt, zu der sich die Herrscherin erniedrigt. Die Königin des Märchens "war zu einem scheußlichen Negersklaven getreten, dessen Oberlippe war wie der Deckel eines Topfes, und seine Unterlippe wie der Ausguß eines Topfes,"³ während bei Barak "die Sterne niedrig, die Ohren wegstehend und der Mund wie ein Spalt war";⁴ schliesslich haben der Neger wie Barak für ihre verkrüppelten Brüder zu sorgen.

WALTER NAUMANN

McPherson College, Kansas

² *Die Erzählungen aus den tausend und ein Nächten*. Vollständige deutsche Ausg. in 12 Bdn., auf Grund der Burtonschen engl. Ausg. besorgt von Fel. Paul Greve (Leipzig: Insel, 1907-8), I, 79-106. Die Übersetzung von Burton war zuerst 1885 erschienen.

³ Greve, I, 93.

⁴ Hugo von Hofmannsthal, *Gesammelte Werke* (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1934), 3. Band, 2. Teil, 18.

A DEFENSE OF THE "RÉCIT DE THÉRAMÈNE"

Most recent critics and historians of French literature have refused to be drawn into the controversy, dating from 1677, as to whether the famous "récit de Théràmène" in the last act of *Phèdre* is a blemish in Racine's otherwise perfect masterpiece. There is no doubt ample justification for avoiding this issue as long as the debate is kept within the narrow limits of rhetoric, imitation, and "vraisemblance" which circumscribed such writers as Subligny, Houdar de la Motte, Boileau, Fénelon, Louis Racine, and La Harpe in their discussions of the passage. It is possible however to approach the question afresh from a more comprehensive conception of the nature of dramatic poetry and to evaluate the "récit" not apart from its context but within the whole organic system of relationships which constitutes the tragedy of *Phèdre*.

Failing to do this, many writers on *Phèdre* have taken the "récit de Théràmène" simply as a more or less conventional "purple passage," pleasing or not according to the critic's own taste, but of no especial significance in the total economy of the tragedy. Such a view has produced endless quibbling over stylistic matters but has contributed little to the solution of the central problem, which in fact it completely ignores. Closely allied to this rhetorical conception is the view, often expressed, that the passage in question is due mainly to Racine's over-zealous admiration of the ancients.¹ But even if imitation of Euripides and Seneca played some part in the composition of the "récit de Théràmène," it is unlikely that Racine, whose genius was matched only by his unrivaled artistry as a tragic playwright, would have permitted his regard for the Greeks and Romans to make him insert a dramatically unsound bravura passage in this mature tragedy where every word advances the course of the heroine's ineluctable march toward catastrophe.

Other critics have sought to dispose of the question by centering their attention on the psychological "vraisemblance" of Racine's

¹ Cf H C Lancaster, *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1929-1942), Part IV, I, 109.

characters. Usually they have simply taken the matter-of-fact view that it is highly *invraisemblable* for Thérémène to use so many words and such a decorative style to narrate Hippolyte's death when it would have been much more "natural" for him merely to state the essential fact that Thésée's prayer for Neptune to punish Hippolyte had been answered by the god in a thoroughly effective way and to report the youth's last words. But it must always be remembered that "vraisemblance" for Racine was nothing remotely like the "réalisme" of the nineteenth century, if it were, a lack of "vraisemblance" would characterize innumerable passages of his tragedies in addition to the much-criticized "récit de Thérémène." Professor Boorsch, reacting against the narrow "conception psychologique" which holds the theater of Corneille to be a series of "études d'âmes" or representations of living persons, has recently opened the way for a more direct approach to the seventeenth-century theater by insisting that "L'art théâtral est, avant tout, l'art d'agir sur les émotions des spectateurs, de se servir de leur âme comme d'un clavier, et d'y faire apparaître, à point nommé et à volonté, la joie ou la crainte, la sympathie, l'espoir, la haine, ou la pitié."² This thesis, which put us on guard against judging Corneille's tragedies simply with respect to the psychological "vraisemblance" of the characters by analogy with people in real life, is just as cogent in regard to Racine's works. Racine, like Corneille, is concerned to produce certain effects rather than to paint psychological portraits in any literal sense. Thus it is both obvious and irrelevant to remark that Thérémène's narrative is longer and more ornate than such a speech would be in a real life situation. This fact in itself should not lead to the hasty conclusion that the passage is a flaw in Racine's great tragedy.

A new and more valid critical judgment on the "récit de Thérémène" must be based on two essential points. The first has to do with the subject and tone of Racine's tragedy, while the second concerns its moral implications. The aim of the French classical dramatist, and of Racine above all, was neither self-expression nor any literal representation of life; it was, as Thierry Maulnier reminds us, to "traiter un sujet"—that is, to "peindre non l'homme,

² Jean Boorsch, "Remarques sur la technique dramatique de Corneille," *Studies by Members of the French Department of Yale University*, Decennial Volume (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), p. 108.

mais l'homme dans un moment de son destin" ³ Unlike Euripides, who treated the subject of Hippolytus, Racine treats the subject of Phèdre—or rather, to speak more precisely and avoid the errors of the static "conception psychologique" which Professor Boorsch warns us against, he treats the subject of Phèdre's passion and her misfortune. Racine is not interested in Hippolyte or in his pathetic fate except in so far as they bear upon the tragic destiny of his heroine. And, despite the last paragraph of the preface written after the performance of his play, Racine has no moral or didactic aims in *Phèdre*. This is not to say that he does not consider an ethical situation in the tragedy, but, as the true artist always does, he considers this situation poetically instead of from the point of view of ethical theory or practice.⁴

These two points explain and perhaps justify the "récit de Théràmène" in two closely related ways. In his brief discussion of this passage, Professor Lancaster remarks that "it is considered too long and too ornate for the situation," and explains that Racine "was following the example of two ancient and of four French writers" and thus "may well have thought that the passage would be well received." Much more significantly, for my present argument, Professor Lancaster admits. "It is true, however, that so prolonged and rhetorical an explanation detracted from the poignancy of the situation by turning the audience's attention to the beauty of the description."⁵ Exactly; and this, I submit, was not a flaw caused by Racine's over-zealous imitation of his predecessors nor was the passage composed simply because the poet thought it might be well received by the audience. It was rather Racine's *intention* here to relieve the emotional poignancy of the situation and, by turning the spectators' attention to the plastic beauty and the verbal harmony of the descriptions, to keep them from giving way to tears over the pathetic and unmerited fate of Hippolyte. A brief announcement of the youth's cruel death, Racine must have felt, would have produced too strong an emotional effect upon his audience and one which would have shifted the interest in a way

³ Thierry Maulnier, *Racine* (Paris: Gallimard, 1935), pp. 53-54.

⁴ For a discussion of this point, though without reference to Racine or French drama, see John Crowe Ransom, "Criticism as Pure Speculation," *The Intent of the Artist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941), pp. 104-06.

⁵ Lancaster, *op. cit.*, Part IV, I, 109-10.

unsuited to his dramatic purpose; the spectators would have overflowed with pity for Hippolyte and would have felt loathing for Phèdre as the unnatural monster responsible for his pathetic end. As a classical dramatist Racine does not wish actual tears at all but only intense aesthetic contemplation, and in this particular instance he does not wish the audience to turn its attention from Phèdre to Hippolyte or to feel hostility toward his tragic heroine. He chooses therefore to take away much of the poignancy of the situation with respect to Hippolyte by making the account of the youth's death a highly-wrought plastic description appealing above all to the spectators' aesthetic sensibility.

The other explanation or justification of the "récit de Thérémène" is, as already suggested, so closely related to the first as to constitute merely another aspect of the same basic concern. It has been prepared for by our insistence upon the fact that Racine is not a moralist or a didactic writer in his plays. Of course neither the author nor his audience are under any illusions about the ethical implications of the situation in *Phèdre*. But partly for this very reason, the moral will is not appealed to and should not be appealed to in this tragedy; indeed, if at any point the poet should call forth moral fervor from his audience, either intentionally or inadvertently, the effect—in so far as the artistic experience is concerned—would be disastrous. Now it is just in acquainting the spectators with the circumstances of Hippolyte's unmerited death that the artist runs the risk of arousing their moral will to condemn Phèdre and perhaps even to blame the author himself for presenting a situation in which an innocent person becomes the victim of a guilty one. But in the same way that the tone and the plastic beauty of the lengthy "récit de Thérémène" attenuate the poignancy of the situation and raise the audience's emotion to the realm of the aesthetic, so these qualities keep the situation from turning back into a situation to be morally determined by the practical will instead of merely contemplated from the point which John Crowe Ransom terms "post-ethical."⁶

The much-discussed "récit de Thérémène," then, has a functional value in the total context of *Phèdre* and materially aids the dramatist in realizing his general intent and his specific intentions in this play. Additional proof of this functional value may be

⁶ Cf. Ransom, *op cit.*, p. 104.

adduced, perhaps, from the fact that scarcely has Théràmène finished his long descriptive narrative when Phèdre—with no motivation other than the inner necessity of the tragedy—surges up so that we can see that, moved more by despair over the irremediable loss of Hippolyte than by repentance or remorse, she is now overwhelmed by the catastrophe toward which her tragic destiny had impelled her from the first moment of the play. If Racine had allowed his audience to become too much involved emotionally in the pathetic fate of Hippolyte or to give way to moral fervor, this capital last scene—the necessary and perfect *aboutissement* of the whole tragedy—would have lost much of its effect. It is not really a paradox then to conclude that the long and ornate "récit de Théràmène" makes an essential contribution to the economy of the tragedy as a whole and more specifically to the dramatic concentration of which Racine alone holds the secret.

CARLOS LYNES, JR.

Simsbury, Connecticut

[Since Mr Lynes quotes me twice—with disapproval—I am allowing myself a brief reply. Throughout his tragedies Racine seeks to inspire "intense aesthetic contemplation." His methods are at times ornate, but often extremely simple. The question is, why should he be ornate in the next to last scene of a tragedy, where the action in most of his plays and his contemporaries' progresses with great rapidity? If his purpose was, as L. proposes, to prevent his audience from becoming too much moved by news of Hippolyte's death, why does Théràmène, after line 1560, become quite simple in his expression and emphasize Phèdre's guilt by referring to Hippolyte's "innocente vie," to his having been "faussement accusé," and to his stepmother as his "mortelle ennemie"? Why does R. show the effect of Hippolyte's death upon Aricie and the effect of Théràmène's words upon Thésée, who is obviously made by them to believe that his wife is guilty? As a matter of fact, the aesthetic repose offered by lines 1498-1560 enables the audience to feel more forcefully the indictment of Phèdre that follows. If we still have sympathy for her, it is because of earlier portions of the play, the view we have had of her struggles and the part that Cénone has had in the affair. Mr L. quotes with approval Thierry Maulnier's remark that Racine's aim was to "traiter un sujet." Now the subject, as presented by Euripides and Seneca, required the *récit*. Racine, with his conception of tragedy, could not have avoided it so easily as L. believes, but he could have made it shorter and less ornate. That he failed to do so was probably due to an increasing tendency towards descriptive writing, already found in *Iphigénie* and to reappear in *Esther*. Whether he was wise or not in so doing remains a matter of taste, for one may be lifted to aesthetic contemplation by the *récit de Théràmène* without having blandly to assert that "tout est au mieux dans la meilleure des tragédies"—

SITUATION AS A TERM IN LITERARY CRITICISM

According to the *NED*, the word *situation* long referred only to physical position. It was applied to cities, houses, the body, its parts, etc., but not to things of the mind. No example of *situated* in the sense of "placed in relation to circumstances" is cited earlier than a work of 1702, or of *situation* as meaning "position in life" or "position of the mind" than one of 1710. The first examples given of the noun as a critical term are much later. They come from texts of 1779.

The novelist who delineates characters by feigned circumstances and situations (*Mirror*, no. 31)

This scene goes entirely for what we call situation and stage effect (*Sheridan, Critic*, III, 1)

The last quotation suggests that the word was, in 1779, new in English criticism, but it had already existed in French critical writings for some eighty years.

Before the seventeenth century, *situation* seems to have been used in France only in regard to things physical. The *Dictionnaire général* cites from the fourteenth century "la situation ou position des estoilles." Early in the sixteenth century Lemaire de Belges wrote that Noah taught cosmography, which he defines as "la situation de la terre, comme il la voit veue auant le deluge."¹ Molière, however, in the first scene of the *Misanthrope* (acted, 1666, published, 1667), refers to a soul that is "bien située," while Bossuet, in his celebrated oration over Henriette d'Angleterre, sister of Charles II, declares that:

rien n'a jamais égalé la fermeté de son âme, ni ce courage paisible, qui, sans faire effort pour s'élever, s'est trouvé par sa naturelle situation au-dessus des accidents les plus redoutables.²

His oration was delivered on Aug. 21, 1670. Ten years later Richelet's Dictionary defined *situation* only with reference to physical objects or to the arrangement of words, but Father Boudhours,³ who reproduced the quotation from Bossuet, stated in 1682 that:

¹ Stecher edition, I, 25.

² *Œuvres choisies de Bossuet*, Paris, Hachette, 1901, IV, 342.

³ *Remarques nouvelles sur la langue françoise*, Paris, 1682, I, 496-7. He might have quoted d'Aubignac, *Pratique du théâtre*, pp. 279-80 in Martino's edition: "un mouvement un peu plus agité que l'assiete ordinaire de nostre ame"

depuis quelques années *situation* se dit dans le figuré plus communément et plus élégamment qu' *assiete* Son esprit n'est jamais dans une même *situation*

In 1694 the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* defined *situation* both in its physical sense and as "l'état, la disposition de l'âme" and "des affaires."

The next step was to apply the term to an arrangement of characters and circumstances in a work of fiction in such a way as to obtain an emotional response. The first example I have found of *situation* in this sense was penned by one who was both a churchman and a dramatist, Brueys, who employed it when he was discussing his religious tragedy. In the preface of his *Gabriele*, published on April 2, 1699, he writes that, in imitating Father Jourdan's *Susanna*,

j'en ay retranché plusieurs Personnages et beaucoup de choses qui ne me paroissent pas convenables à nos Spectacles, et j'en ay ajouté d'autres qui convenoient à mon dessein, et qui m'ont fourni de nouvelles situations, et une catastrophe différente

Three years later Dufresny made a Marquis say that "On aime à voir . . . des situations qui surprennent."⁴ He is speaking of comedies. In 1711 the word was still considered new, for in that year Malezieu declared⁵ that a play of which he did not approve was characterized by

Les situations, c'est le mot à la mode, les événements extraordinaires et imprévus, des passions outrées.

Other authors of 1711 were more hospitable. The abbé de Pons spoke of "des situations très-intéressantes" and Dufresny of "tant de belles situations."⁶ Yet in 1714 Mlle Barbier still regarded the word as an intruder. In speaking of a scene that lacked probability, but roused the emotions, she exclaimed:⁷

⁴ Prologue of *Le Double Veuvage*, p. 5 in the edition of Paris, Briasson, 1747.

⁵ Preface, p. ii, that he wrote for the abbé Genest's *Joseph*, Paris, Ganeau et Estienne, 1711.

⁶ Both remarks referred to Crébillon's *Rhadamiste et Zénobie*. They are quoted by the frères Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*, xv, 87, 84.

⁷ *Saisons littéraires, second recueil*, composed in 1714 and published in 1722; quoted by the frères Parfaict, *op. cit.*, xiv, 433. She is referring to Crébillon's *Atrée et Thyeste*, III, 3, a scene in which Atrée threatens to murder Théodamie unless Plisthène, who loves her, kills her father.

Voilà . ce que certaines gens appellent situations, pourvû qu'elles soient dans une Scene, il n'importe comment elles y sont

Started on its way by these authors and their contemporaries, the word spread like a fire in dead leaves. It was, for instance, frequently employed by Dubos, Louis Riccoboni,⁸ the frères Parfaict,⁹ and the abbé Nadal.¹⁰ The last of these seeks to indicate its meaning so far as tragedy was concerned:

Situation en fait de Tragedie, est souvent un etat interessant et douloureux; c'est une contradiction de mouvemens qui s'élevent tout à la fois, et qui se balancent, c'est une indecision en nous de nos propres sentimens. C'est dans le Cid qu'il faut chercher le modele des situations. Rodrigue est entre son honneur et son amour, Chimene entre le meurtrier de son pere et son amant, elle est entre des devoirs sacrés, et une passion violente

Nadal is pointing to a model rather than giving a strict definition, for the word had already been applied to comedy and to tragedies where the conflict was less within the souls of the characters than it is in the *Cid*. He and his contemporaries would probably have accepted the definitions given by the *Dictionnaire général*, "Moment d'une action dramatique, narrative, où la position des personnages est particulièrement intéressante," and by the *NED*, "A particular conjunction of circumstances (esp one of a striking or exciting nature) under which the characters are presented in a novel or play."

Situations had, of course, existed in literature long before the seventeenth century, but early critics had been so deeply concerned with form and other matters that they were slow in feeling the need for the new use of the word. It must have been the increase of interest in criticism, so characteristic of the late seventeenth century in France, that induced Brueys to employ it. In so doing he may have received help from his clerical colleagues, for in the extension of the term from the purely physical to the moral and to the fictional churchmen played a striking part. Bossuet, Boudhours, Brueys, Pons, Dubos, and Nadal were all ecclesiastics. If

⁸ Cf. Dubos, *Réflexions critiques*, fourth edition, Paris, 1740, I, 55, 103, 125, 237, and Louis Riccoboni, *Réflexions historiques et critiques*, Paris, 1738, pp 148-9

⁹ *Op. cit.*, XIV, 476-7, 508, 511, etc.

¹⁰ *Œuvres mêlées*, Paris, 1738, II, 198, 200, 215-6. Cf also the examples given by Littré from Voltaire, Marmontel, etc

Bossuet, who converted Brueys to Catholicism, suggested to him, by his praise of Henriette d'Angleterre, the use of *situation* as a literary term, lovers of the stage may well pardon the bishop his thunderous attacks upon Corneille and Molière

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

SUR UNE LETTRE DE BAUDELAIRE

En novembre 1842, Baudelaire écrivit à Mme Aupick.¹ "Ma chère mère, je suis désolé de t'affliger encoire pour le moment.—Mais si tu veux les motifs entre autres la privation totale de pantalon et de chapeau, pour le moment, m'empêchent d'aller à l'Ecole." Dans une note, l'éditeur des *Dernières lettres*, adoptant une hypothèse de Maurice Tourneux, identifie l'école en question avec "L'Ecole des chartes, dont Baudelaire suivit les cours, et où il rencontra notamment Poulet-Malassis."

Or, Pierre Dufay, lorsqu'il préparait son étude sur Poulet-Malassis, a fouillé les archives, fort bien tenues, de l'Ecole des chartes, et, alors qu'il y a recueilli d'abondants renseignements sur son sujet, il n'a pas trouvé la moindre trace du nom de Baudelaire sur les registres.² On peut affirmer que Baudelaire ne mit jamais les pieds dans cet établissement dont les programmes destinés à former des archivistes, n'étaient guère faits pour attirer un apprenti poète. Ne savons-nous pas, d'ailleurs, que, dans sa jeunesse, Baudelaire manifestait un profond mépris pour l'histoire?³

Mais alors, de quelle école s'agit-il? Evidemment de l'Ecole d'application d'état-major, située rue de Grenelle, dont le général Aupick était directeur depuis le 1^{er} mars 1841, et qu'il s'apprêtait à quitter, en novembre 1842, pour prendre le commandement de la

¹ Lettre publiée dans Baudelaire, *Dernières lettres inédites à sa mère*, Paris (1926), p. 16

² Pierre Dufay a, en outre, établi que Poulet-Malassis ne fut admis au concours de l'Ecole des chartes qu'en novembre 1847.

³ En 1838, le professeur d'histoire de Louis-le-Grand, dans son rapport trimestriel, a la note suivante sur Baudelaire: "Cet élève, et il le dit lui-même, paraît persuadé que l'histoire est parfaitement inutile." (Léon Lemonnier, *Enquêtes sur Baudelaire*, 1929, p. 8)

place de Paris,⁴ avec résidence au N° 7 de la place Vendôme. A la fin de la lettre, en effet, il est fait allusion au "nouveau domicile" de Mme Aupick. Bien entendu, il n'était pas question pour Baudelaire de suivre les cours de cette école militaire, où, comme le nom l'indique, on formait les officiers d'état-major, mais simplement de se rendre à une invitation de Mme Aupick, soit que celle-ci eût demandé à son fils de venir la voir, soit, plus vraisemblablement, qu'elle l'eût prié d'assister à une réception d'adieu, donnée à l'occasion du changement d'affectation du général. La lettre avait pour but d'expliquer pourquoi Baudelaire ne pouvait satisfaire à ce désir, refus qui, il le savait, "affligerait" sa mère.

A la lumière de ces précisions, la lettre perd quelque peu de son importance purement biographique, mais elle gagne, ce me semble, en résonances psychologiques. Car la raison donnée, "entre autres," se charge de sous-entendus. Il ne faut pas voir dans cette "privation totale de pantalon et de chapeau," une preuve du dénuement—vraiment peu ordinaire—dans lequel se serait trouvé Baudelaire. Celui-ci venait de se faire rendre des comptes de tutelle, et, depuis juillet, date à laquelle ces comptes avaient été définitivement liquidés, il gaspillait joyeusement la fortune dont il avait la libre disposition. C'est à cette époque de dandysme fastidieux que se rapporte l'anecdote contée par Champfleury,⁵ selon laquelle Baudelaire aurait commandé, d'un seul coup, douze habits, pareils "à celui de Goethe, qu'on voit sur les pipes de porcelaine, en Allemagne." Un chapeau haut de forme d'un modèle spécial et un pantalon de casimir, non collant contrairement à la mode, constituaient deux des singularités du costume extraordinaire qu'il avait adopté en 1842.⁶ En prétextant que c'était le manque de chapeau et de pantalon qui l'empêchait d'aller à l'Ecole, Baudelaire insinuait qu'il ne possédait pas la tenue de mise dans le milieu sur lequel régnait le général Aupick. C'était décocher un trait malicieux contre son beau-père, qui n'admettait pas, comme chacun le sait, les manquements aux usages reçus. Et pour bien montrer que cette insolence ne s'adressait pas à sa mère, "pour prouver" qu'il n'était "pas méchant," et qu'il pensait à elle, Baudelaire lui avait envoyé, le matin même, des pendants

⁴ Le général Aupick fut nommé Commandant du département de la Seine et de la place de Paris, le 11 novembre 1842.

⁵ *Souvenirs et portraits de jeunesse*, p. 326.

⁶ D'après Le Vavas seur, dans E. & J. Crépet, *Baudelaire*, 44-45.

d'oreille, avec lesquels, disait-il, elle pourrait "festoyer son nouveau domicile, à la prochaine occasion,"—autre preuve, s'il en était besoin après les explications qui précèdent, que Baudelaire, à ce moment-là, n'était pas dépourvu de ressources.

ALBERT FEUILLERAT

Yale University

SONNET STRUCTURE IN CHAPMAN'S BLANK VERSE

It is of course easier to recognize than to describe a sonnet. Therefore in this paper I shall do more quoting than describing. In the ticklish business of recognizing sonnets in blank verse I have usually limited myself to the two least mistakable kinds of sonnet structure—the Italian, with its twofold development, divided usually into eight and six lines; and the English, with its fourfold development, divided usually into three quatrains and a concluding couplet that gives point to the whole.¹

Chapman, though he is to be numbered among the enemies of the love sonnet, wrote a fair number of non-amorous sonnets. Furthermore, like other Elizabethans, he must have read many sonnets. And what is most important, the sonnet form must have impressed itself upon his mind; for in his dramatic blank verse there are many passages constructed, whether consciously or not, upon a sonnet pattern.

One of the poems attributed to Chapman in *England's Parnassus* (1600) contains twelve lines of blank verse capped by a couplet.² This same unit appears frequently in Chapman's plays. Of course, the trick of introducing a couplet into blank verse is widespread in Elizabethan drama. Yet when such a couplet ends a speech, or ends a paragraph in a speech, and when that speech strongly resembles a sonnet, then it is justifiable to attribute an ordinary device to a particular influence.³ Take for instance the first fourteen lines of Tamyra's soliloquy:

¹ Since many of Chapman's regular sonnets do not divide themselves, in thought and rhythm, into these exact proportions, I have not hesitated to accept a similar flexibility in his blank-verse sonnets.

² *The Poems of George Chapman*, ed P B Bartlett (New York, 1941), p. 373.

³ It is useful to compare in this connection Daniel's heavily rhymed play, *The Tragedy of Cleopatra*. The accidental introduction of a couplet after

Revenge, that ever red sitt'st in the eyes
 Of injur'd ladies, till we crown thy brows
 With bloody laurel, and receive from thee
 Justice for all our [honour's] injury,
 Whose wings none fly, that wrath or tyranny
 Have ruthless made and bloody, enter here,
 Enter, O enter! And, though length of time
 Never lets any scape thy constant justice,
 Yet now prevent that length Fly, fly, and here
 Fix thy steel footsteps here, O here, where still
 Earth, mov'd with pity, yielded and embrac'd
 My love's fair figure, drawn in his dear blood,
 And mark'd the place, to show thee where was done
 The cruell'st murder that e'er fled the sun⁴

Other rimes in blank verse may also have significance. In the following passage it is perhaps reasonable to believe that the unexpected rimes may be the result of Chapman's awareness of a form underneath his blank verse.⁵

Yet shall you see it here here will be one
 Young, learned, valiant, virtuous, and full mann'd,
 One on whom Nature spent so rich a hand
 That with an ominous eye she wept to see
 So much consum'd her virtuous treasury
 Yet as the winds sing through a hollow tree
 And (since it lets them pass through) let it stand,
 But a tree solid (since it gives no way
 To their wild rage) they rend up by the root
 So this whole man
 (That will not wind with every crooked way,
 Trod by the servile world) shall reel and fall

a series of alternating rimes does not necessarily, when it is added to the preceding three quatrains, make a sonnet (as iv, 902-915, 1067-1080), But a couplet may be significant. For example, in Act I beginning with line 115 there is a sonnet perfect in rime-scheme and sense At line 151 another one begins, and, in the long speech it is a part of, it forms a separate little section. These are no sonnets by accident, but independent compositions, able and worthy to stand alone

⁴ *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*, I, ii, 1-14. Cf *Monsieur D'Olwe*, I, i, 28-41. All references are to the two-volume edition of the plays by T. M. Parrott

⁵ This is a recognizable characteristic of the sonneteer Daniel writing his closet dramas For often when the theme awakens his sonnet instincts he introduces rimes. See *The Tragedy of Philotas*, III, iii, 1088-1101, *The Queen's Arcadia*, II, i, 422-435; III, i, 1019-1032; V, ii, 2156-2169.

Before the frantic puffs of blind-born chance,
That pipes through empty men, and makes them dance.*

But even when there are no rimes, and not even a couplet, we may find as a part of a long speech a paragraph showing the influence of the sonnet form.

I tell thee Love is Nature's second sun,
Causing a spring of virtues where he shines,
And as without the sun, the world's great eye,
All colours, beauties, both of Art and Nature,
Are given in vain to men, so without Love
All beauties bred in women are in vain,
All virtues born in men lie buried,
For Love informs them as the sun doth colours;
And as the sun, reflecting his warm beams
Against the earth, begets all fruits and flowers,
So Love, fair shining in the inward man,
Brings forth in him the honourable fruits
Of valour, wit, virtue, and haughty thoughts,
Brave resolution, and divine discourse †

The examples we have so far been considering illustrate only part of the influence of the sonnet form. For the sonnet has more than a rhythm and a symmetry of its own; it has a characteristic logic. And this logic is particularly well suited for the reflective speech, especially the soliloquy, where the thought may be expressed by contrast between the octave and the sestet, or by a three-fold development of quatrains and a couplet which puts a point to the whole.⁸ The following examples, I think, speak for themselves:

Who cannot friend himself is foe to any,
And to be fear'd of all, and that is it
Makes me so scorn'd; but make me what you can,
Never so wicked and so full of fiends,
I never yet was traitor to my friends:

* *Bussy D'Ambois*, v, 11, 32-45.

† *All Fools*, I, 1, 97-110. It is worth mentioning that Havelock Ellis in his selections from Chapman chooses these fourteen lines, recognizing the existence of the paragraph. See his *Chapman, With Illustrative Passages* (Nonesuch Press, 1934), p. 96.

⁸ In Lodge's play, *The Wounds of Civil War* (1594), the reflective soliloquy of Marius (III, iv, 1191-1204) is a sonnet. The play also contains a good blank-verse sonnet with the same kind of logical development (I, 51-64). One of Daniel's best sonnets is the philosophical soliloquy in *The Tragedy of Philotas*, I, 1, 58-71.

The laws of friendship I have ever held,
 As my religion, and for other laws
 He is a fool that keeps them with more care
 Than they keep him safe, rich, and popular
 For riches, and for popular respects
 Take them amongst ye, minions, but for safety,
 You shall not find the least flaw in my arms
 To pierce or taint me, what will great men be
 To please the King and bear authority!⁹

Did ever Curtian Gulf play such a part?
 Had Curtius been so us'd, if he had brook'd
 That ravenous whirlpool, pour'd his solid spirits
 Through earth' dissolved sinews, stopp'd her veins,
 And rose with saved Rome, upon his back,
 As I swum pools of fire and gulfs of brass
 To save my country, thrust this venturous arm
 Beneath her ruins, took her on my neck
 And set her safe on her appeased shore?
 And opes the King a fouler bog than this,
 In his so rotten bosom to devour
 Him that devour'd what else had swallow'd him,
 In a detraction so with spite embru'd,
 And drown such good in such ingratitude?¹⁰

His strange aims are to cross the common custom
 Of servile nobles, in which he's so ravish'd,
 That quite the earth he leaves, and up he leaps
 On Atlas' shoulders, and from thence looks down,
 Viewing how far off other high ones creep,
 Rich, poor of reason, wander, all pale looking,
 And trembling but to think of their sure deaths,
 Their lives so base are, and so rank their breaths
 Which I teach Guise to heighten, and make sweet
 With Life's dear odours, a good mind and name;
 For which he only loves me, and deserves
 My love and life, which through all deaths I vow
 Resolving this, whatever change can be,
 Thou hast created, thou hast ruin'd me!¹¹

For we shall know each other, and past death
 Retain those forms of knowledge learn'd in life;
 Since, if what here we learn, we there shall lose,
 Our immortality were not life, but time

⁹ *Byron's Conspiracy*, II, i, 131-144.

¹⁰ *Byron's Conspiracy*, III, ii, 65-78.

¹¹ *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambours*, II, i, 264-277. Line 263 acts as a kind of introduction and is not really part of the paragraph

And that our souls in reason are immortal
 Their natural and proper objects prove,
 Which immortality and knowledge are
 For to that object ever is referr'd
 The nature of the soul, in which the acts
 Of her high faculties are still employ'd
 And that true object must her powers obtain
 To which they are in nature's aim directed,
 Since 'twere absurd to have her set an object
 Which possibly she never can aspire¹²

There are many passages, over or under fourteen lines, that in thought development seem to reflect sonnet influence.

O had I never married but for form,
 Never vow'd faith but purpos'd to deceive,
 Never made conscience of any sin,
 But cloak'd it privately and made it common,
 Nor never honour'd been in blood or mind,
 Happy had I been then, as others are
 Of the like licence, I had then been honour'd,
 Liv'd without envy, custom had benumb'd
 All sense of scruple and all note of frailty,
 My fame had been untouch'd, my heart unbroken:
 But (shunning all) I strike on all offence,
 O husband! Dear friend! O my conscience!¹³

O the strange difference 'twixt us and the stars,
 They work with inclinations strong and fatal,
 And nothing know, and we know all their working,
 And nought can do, or nothing can prevent!
 Rude ignorance is beastly, knowledge wretched;
 The heavenly Powers envy what they enjoin,
 We are commanded t'imitate their natures,
 In making all our ends eternity,
 And in that imitation we are plagued,
 And worse than they esteem'd that have no souls
 But in their nostrils, and like beasts expire,
 As they do that are ignorant of arts,
 By drowning their eternal parts in sense
 And sensual affectations while we live
 Our good parts take away, the more they give¹⁴

¹² *The Tragedy of Caesar and Pompey*, v, ii, 137-150 See also *The Gentleman Usher*, iv, iii, 24-37.

¹³ *Bussy D'Ambours*, v, iv, 174-185. Cf. also iii, i, 73-86

¹⁴ *Byron's Conspiracy*, iii, iii, 5-19.

be free all worthy spirits,
 And stretch yourself for greatness and for height,
 Untruss your slaveries, you have height enough
 Beneath this steep heaven to use all your reaches,
 'Tis too far off to let you, or respect you
 Give me a spirit that on this life's rough sea
 Loves to have his sails fill'd with a lusty wind,
 Even till his sail-yards tremble, his masts crack,
 And his rapt ship run on her prow so low
 That she drinks water, and her keel plows air.
 There is no danger to a man who knows
 What life and death is, there's not any law
 Exceeds his knowledge, neither is it lawful
 That he should stoop to any other law
 He goes before them, and commands them all,
 That to himself is a law rational¹⁵

And, finally, the characteristic thought development of the sonnet provides a good framework for an extended simile. Chapman's best blank-verse sonnet illustrates this.

And as great seamen, using all their wealth
 And skills in Neptune's deep invisible paths,
 In tall ships richly built and rubb'd with brass,
 To put a girdle round about the world,
 When they have done it, coming near their haven,
 Are fain to give a warning piece, and call
 A poor, staid fisherman, that never pass'd
 His country's sight, to waft and guide them in
 So when we wander furthest through the waves
 Of glassy Glory, and the gulfs of State,
 Topt with all titles, spreading all our reaches,
 As if each private arm would sphere the earth,
 We must to Virtue for her guide resort,
 Or we shall shipwreck in our safest port¹⁶

All of my examples, I am aware, are not of equal merit. But it seems reasonable to me that the existence of some excellent blank-verse sonnets should lead us to consider other, less-perfect ex-

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, III, iii, 130-145 Cf. III, i, 47-62; and also *Byron's Tragedy*, III, i, 18-30; *Bussy D'Ambois*, II, ii, 207-221; *The Gentleman Usher*, IV, iii, 11-23.

¹⁶ *Bussy D'Ambois*, I, i, 20-33. Cf. also *The Tragedy of Caesar and Pompey*, II, ii, 20-33 *All Fools*, I, i, 97-110, *The Tragedy of Othello*, I, i, 68-80; *Bussy D'Ambois*, IV, i, 7-21; *Byron's Conspiracy*, III, i, 6-23; V, i, 1-14

amples, not as blank-verse sonnets, but as blank verse influenced by the sonnet structure. And I am not interested in merely demonstrating the novelty of undetected blank-verse sonnets in Chapman. I am interested in the significance of the relationship between blank verse and the sonnet. And the significance—though it will require further research for me to be more explicit—seems to lie in the influence that the sonnet (and other stanzaic forms) may have had on thought and rhythm patterns in Elizabethan blank verse.

ARNOLD STEIN

University of Minnesota

STERNE AND SENSIBILITY IN AMERICAN DIARIES ¹

In his chapter on "Sterne and Sensibility,"² Herbert Ross Brown describes the influence on both American writers and readers of Laurence Sterne and those who followed his sentimental lead. That this line of influence extended widely over American thought is emphasized by its occasional presence in American diaries and journals, a body of informal writings to which Professor Brown makes only incidental reference. In the diaries and journals of William Ellery,³ Sarah Eve,⁴ Albigence Waldo,⁵ William Rogers,⁶ and Alexander Macaulay⁷ there can be clearly discerned the minds and temperaments of those Americans who so eagerly read *The Power of Sympathy*, *Charlotte Temple*, and the rest—who were, in fact, preconditioned to the American novel of sensibility. Even though these diarists do not always imitate Sterne and his

¹ The materials for this article represent part of the data on literary ideas and modes in America which I have collected while working with Professor William Matthews on an annotated list of American diaries and journals written before 1861.

² *The Sentimental Novel in America, 1789-1860* (Durham, N. C., 1940), pp. 75-100.

³ *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, xi (October, 1887), 318-329; (January, 1888), 476-481; xii (July, 1888), 190-199.

⁴ *Ibid.*, v (July, 1881), 19-36 and (October, 1881), 191-205.

⁵ *Ibid.*, xxi (October, 1897), 299-323.

⁶ *The Journal of a Brigade Chaplain in the Campaign of 1799*, Rhode Island Historical Tracts, vii (Providence, 1879).

⁷ *William and Mary College Quarterly*, xi (January, 1903), 180-191.

followers in sustained or lengthy detail, they seem to believe that situations which are quaintly and sentimentally humorous, call for sympathy, or involve extreme emotionality can best be recorded in language patterned after that of Sterne, Mackenzie, *et al*. Equally significant, their responses to those situations are, by a kind of conditioned reflex, almost automatically those of men and women of sensibility.

William Ellery sets out to think and act as a man of sensibility.⁸ In his four short travel diaries, 1777-1779, he records in great detail odd incidents, the kind that Sterne calls "hobbyhorsical," over which he can be at once sentimental and humorous. Such incidents may actually call forth an allusion to *Tristram Shandy*, as when one of his traveling companions is spattered with mud

Admissi rursus teneatis amici. Dr Slop was not more bespattered when Patriot in his circumgyrations from his broad hoofs almost suffocated that son of AEsculapius.⁹

Most often, however, it is merely the Shandean narrative manner and point-of-view which are evident in his diary. Ellery writes of the landlady at the inn at East Haddam—to take only one example of many:

Mrs Emmons, our Landlady, is one of the most laughing creatures that ever I saw. She begins and ends everything she says, and she talks as much as most females, with a laugh, which is in truth the silliest laugh that ever I heard. As man hath been defined to be a laughing animal, as Laughter manifests a good disposition and tends to make one fat, I will not find fault with laughing, let Solomon and Chesterfield have said what they may have said against it. Indeed the former says there is a time to laugh, but with the latter it is at no time admissible. However, Chesterfield when he condemns it, hath the character of a courtier only in Idea, and does not regard common life. And Horace I think says *ride si sapias*. The *Spectator* hath divided laughter into several species some of which he censures roundly, but doth not as I remember condemn seasonable, gentle laughter. Therefore my pleasant Landlady, laugh on!¹⁰

⁸ I have accepted Dr. Brown's working definition of sensibility as feeling "as an end in itself" (p. 74). The all-important matters of vocabulary, style, and point-of-view are, I hope, evident from the citations from the diaries themselves.

⁹ *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, xi (January, 1888), 479-480. Cf. also, *ibid.*, xi (October, 1887), 326-327.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xii (July, 1888), 192. Cf. also, *ibid.*, xi (October, 1888), 322 and 327-329; xi (January, 1888), 479-480; xii (July, 1888), 190, 191, 193, 195, 196, and 198.

Even this bit of eclectic philosophy, couched as it is in a style that shares much of Sterne's whimsical pedantry and archaism, shows that Ellery's is, above all, a sentimental journey

Unlike Ellery, the others under consideration here are not specifically Shandean. Significantly their sensibility has lost most of its purely literary associations. It is perhaps the sensibility of the average American reader, not that of the Sternophile, as is that of Ellery.

The diary of Sarah Eve, December 13, 1772-December 19, 1773, is most often a record of the pleasant life of a genteel young lady of Philadelphia. That life seems to have been full of the slight emotional *stimuli* so dear to the person of refined sensibilities. After her death in December, 1774, there appeared a "Character" of her, written perhaps by Benjamin Rush, whom she was to marry.

She possessed the most exquisite and delicate sensibility of soul. Upon hearing of distress of any body of any kind, she did not show her sympathy by expressions of pity, or by dropping a tear in company, but by the less equivocal sign of an affecting silence.¹¹

Her diary bears this "Character" out. On June 3 and July 5, 1773, she comments *à propos* of the sadness of life in general.

Will fortune never cease to persecute us? but why complain! for at the worst what is poverty? it is living more according to nature—luxury is not nature but art.

I do not know how I feel, I cannot describe it. It is a kind of pleasing melancholy, I wish not to hear any one talk, nor to do so myself—language cannot express it.¹²

It should be noted here, as in the diarists who follow, that the mere expression of emotional stress does not make the diarist a man or woman of sensibility. What is important is that they automatically express their feelings in the rather specialized manner of the school of Sterne and Mackenzie.

Albigece Waldo, in his diary for November 10, 1777-January 8, 1778, writes generally of the cold, hunger, and suffering at Valley Forge. Yet such matters are very often points of departure for philosophical musings on the vicissitudes of life, solitude, home and fireside, fate, and virtue. On December 23, 1777, he writes,

¹¹ *Ibid.*, v (July, 1881), 21.

¹² *Ibid.*, v (July, 1881), 192 and 194.

This evening an excellent Player on the Violin in that soft kind of Musick, which is so finely adapted to stir up the tender Passions, while he was playing in the next Tent to mine, these kind of soft Airs it immediately called up in remembrance all the endearing expressions, the Tender Sentiments, the sympathetic friendship that has given so much satisfaction and sensible pleasure to me from the first time I gained the heart & affection of the tenderest of the Fair A thousand agreeable little incidents which have Occur'd since our happy connection, and which would have pass'd totally unnoticed by such who are now strangers to the soft & sincere passion of Love, were now recall'd to my mind, and filled me with these tender emotions, and Agreeable Reflections, which cannot be described, and which in spite of my Philosophy forced out the sympathetic tear I wish'd to have the Music Cease, and yet dreaded its ceasing, least I should loose sight of these dear Ideas, which gave me pain and pleasure at the same instant. Ah Heaven why is it that our harder fate so often deprives us of enjoyment of what we most wish to enjoy this side of thy brighter realms There is something in this strong passion of Love far more agreeable than what we can derive from any of the other Passions and which Duller Souls & Cheerless minds are insensible of, & laugh at—let such fools laugh at me¹³

This, with minor variations, is most often the spirit of the diary. This spirit is particularly marked in one of the last entries, on January 6, 1778, where Waldo writes a conventionally dramatic adieu.

If I should happen to lose this little Journal, any fool may laugh that finds it,—since I know that there is nothing in it but the natural flowings & reflections of my heart, which is human as well as other Peoples—and if there is a great deal of folly in it—there is no intended ill nature—and am sure there is much Sincerety, especially when I mention my family, whom I cannot help saying and am not asham'd to say I Love But I begin to grow Sober, I shall be home sick again.—Muses attend!—File off to the right grim melancholly! Seek no more an asylum in thine Enemy's breast!—Waft me hence ye Muses to the brow of Mount Parnassus! for to the summit, I dare not, will not presume to climb¹⁴

William Rogers' diary of Sullivan's campaign against the Six Nations, June 15-September 14, 1779, is particularly valuable as a chaplain's record of a frontier military campaign. Generally Rogers is satisfied to describe in detail the men, their activities, and his concern over their salvation. Yet twice the thought of death and the barbarism of the British-seduced Indians move him to statements of melancholic sensibility. On June 28, 1779, he is passing a place where American soldiers had been recently massacred by Indians.

¹³ *Ibid.* XXI (October. 1897). 311.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* XXI (October. 1897). 321

In passing this melancholy vale, an universal gloom appeared on the countenances of both officers and men without distinction, and from the eyes of many, as if by a sudden impulse, dropt the sympathizing tear¹⁵

Later, on July 8, 1779, he writes of the Indians and the British

Good God! who, after such repeated instances of cruelty, can ever be totally reconciled to that government which divesting itself of the feelings of humanity, has influenced the savage tribes to kill and wretchedly to torture to death, persons of each sex and of every age—the prattling infant, the blooming maid and persons of venerable years, have alike fallen victims to its vindictive rage¹⁶

Even over religion Rogers has not been so eloquent as this.

The diary of Alexander Macaulay, February 19-February 26, 1783, records a journey from Louisa County to Yorktown, Virginia. Writing the diary in letters to an unidentified correspondent, Macaulay gives amusing accounts of people and inns. In particular, he tells of his meeting with an "unfortunate Genevese." After recounting this man's sad story of the disappearance of freedom in Europe, he writes that the "Genevese" was

probably worthy of a better Fate; but alas, the good Mans Lot is often in this World Gall & Bitterness while Heaven with anguish records a spotless heart, and oft associates virtue with despair. Avaunt melancholy! I beg pardon for this digression. I forget I was only writing a Journal for your amusement.¹⁷

Macaulay, as the others, has expressed his response to this sort of situation properly and conventionally in the plaintive manner of the man of feeling.

The nature of these five diaries indicates that the colonial taste for Sterne and sensibility had been developed well before the first American novel of sensibility was written. Only Ellery perhaps entirely represents the American who could say, as does a writer in the *Massachusetts Magazine* in 1794, "... I felt myself all over Sternified."¹⁸ Yet all five represent in varying degrees the writer of sensibility as diarist.

ROY HARVEY PEARCE

Baltimore, Maryland

¹⁵ *The Journal of a Brigade Chaplain in the Campaign of 1779*, Rhode Island Historical Tracts, VII (Providence, 1879), 35

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 58

¹⁷ *Wellham and Mary College Quarterly*, XI (January, 1903), 185

¹⁸ Quoted by H. R. Brown, *op cit*, p. 91

GOD'S "PLENITUDE" IN THE POETRY OF GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS

It can be safely assumed that the indoctrination which prepared Gerard Manley Hopkins for membership in the Jesuit order included discussions or self-imposed studies in the theory of God's "plenitude." In the light of this theory, Hopkins' well known poem "Pied Beauty" takes on an added significance.

The fullest dogmatic expression of the theory of God's plenitude is to be found in the writings of the medieval theologians. Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy has gathered the relevant texts and has discussed the philosophic significance of the idea not only among the medieval doctors but as a factor in the eighteenth century Enlightenment.¹ The theory of God's plenitude is, at bottom, a theodicy, a justification of the ways of God to men. As a theodicy, it seeks to exculpate God for having created a world in which things seem imperfect to greater or lesser degree. The explanation which the theodicy offers is that imperfect as the world may be, it is nevertheless, "the best of all possible worlds" to state the explanation in its favorite eighteenth century form. It is not an optimistic claiming that the world is, for a fact, the best of all possible worlds, it means, rather, that any other world conceivable would be worse. Things appear imperfect only to the human eye, but to God, to whom all things are equal and acceptable, they are good in their respective ways. The imperfect creations are arranged in a ladder or chain of beings with the most perfect creations at the top and the least perfect at the bottom. There are no missing links in the chain for a gap would imply a deficiency on God's part as if he were incapable of sufficient creative ability to create enough different things to fill up the world. The world, therefore, from the viewpoint of the theodicy is "chock-full" of things. In the technical language of the theologians, the world is made up of a "plenum formarum." God's plenitude is seen in the variety or multiplicity of things in the world.

To Hopkins, the theory of God's plenitude supplied the inspiration for his poem, "Pied Beauty." In his vision of God's loving kindness lavished on a world of lovely things in nature, the stress is

¹ Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Baltimore, 1936).

not so much on God's creative ability but on his creative ingenuity, so to speak. Hopkins has a "poet's eye" (as Wordsworth said of Dryden) for the beauties of nature, but, in order to give explicit expression to his vision of God's overflowing ingenuity, he is concerned in his poem not only with the ordinarily beautiful but with the quaintly beautiful. It is as if God were rising to a challenge to create not only a multiplicity of discrete forms but a multiplicity within any one category. The variety within any one category, therefore, is best displayed in a quality of quaintness which differentiates the multiple forms. Things variegated or splotted with colors—pied beauty, in short—these display God's creative ingenuity.

Glory be to God for dappled things—
 For skies of couple-colour as a brinded cow,
 For rose moles all in stipple upon trout that swim,
 Fresh-firecoal chestnut falls, finches' wings,
 Landscape plotted and pieced-fold, fallow, and plough

Not only do all objects serve God equally—although in their differences they appear from the human point of view to be unequal or imperfect in varying degree—but men in their varying social-economic functions also serve God equally. Differences in social-economic status, by analogy with the ladder of natural objects, are also imbedded metaphysically in the scheme of the universe. Hence, the multiplicity of vocations, butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers, is also to be enjoyed.

And all trades, their gear, and tackle and trim

Even the variety of the tools of trade or vocation display a quaintness of beauty, but again the variety is important because it reflects the ingenuity of God who made such a world possible.

The poem concludes by emphasizing originality, quaintness: the evidences, that is to say, of God's ingenuity.

All things counter, original, spare, strange;
 Whatever is fickle, freckled (who knows how?)
 With swift, slow, sweet, sour; adazzle, dim,
 He fathers-forth whose beauty is past change;
 Praise him

* *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. Robert Bridges (Oxford, 1930), p. 36.

"Pied Beauty," consequently, is not an exercise in surrealist eccentricity. It does not state merely that variety is the spice of life, variety is not the spice but the food of life to the true believer. The poem reflects an integrated religious experience with intellectual roots in a theory of God's plenitude carefully nurtured by the church in which Hopkins found his spiritual home.

SAMUEL KLIGER

Northwestern University

MILL AND PAULINE: THE 'REVIEW' THAT 'RETARDED' BROWNING'S FAME

Shortly after the publication of *Pauline* in March, 1833, Browning forwarded a dozen copies of the poem to the Rev. W. J. Fox, editor of the *Monthly Repository*.¹ Fox, in turn, sent a copy to John Stuart Mill, who was then a rather frequent contributor to his magazine. Mill read the poem several times and annotated it in detail, with the intention of publishing a review. But his article never saw print because, as Browning told a correspondent, "he found he had been forestalled by a flippant line in the Review which he was accustomed at that time to write for."² Here the history of Mill's article becomes rather obscure, owing to disagreement among critics as to the identity of the "Review," some asserting that it was *Tait's Magazine*, others, that it was the *Examiner*.³

There are two neglected passages which, I believe, satisfactorily

¹ Cf. Mrs. E. F. Bridell-Fox, "Robert Browning," *The Argosy*, XLIX (Feb., 1890), 109, and Mary Dean Reneau, "First Editions of Browning's *Pauline*," *Baylor University Browning Interests*, Second Series (July, 1931), 45.

² *Letters of Robert Browning*, ed. T. L. Hood (New Haven, 1933), p. 195. As late as 1881 Browning was apparently still unaware of the fact that Mill had actually written a review of *Pauline*. For in the letter just cited, he wrote "The pencil notes of John Mill which he meant to construct an article upon . . . are at the end of the copy of *Pauline* in Forster's Library at Kensington" (*Ibid*).

³ For representative opinions consult the following: E. Gosse, "The Early Writings of Robert Browning," *The Century Magazine*, XXIII (Dec., 1881), 193; W. L. Phelps, "Notes on Browning's *Pauline*," *MLN*, XLVII (May, 1932), 293; W. C. DeVane, *A Browning Handbook* (New York, 1935), p. 43; and W. H. Griffin and H. C. Munchin, *The Life of Robert Browning* (3rd ed., London, 1938), pp. 58-59.

solve the problem. The first, written by the daughter of W. J. Fox, runs as follows "Mr. Mill, apparently at my father's request, wrote a review of 'Pauline' for the *Examiner*, which that paper declined, and Mr. Mill in his note (which lies before me) says that he shall send his review to *Tait*"⁴ The second passage throws further light on the history of Mill's article and is from a volume of reminiscences by Dean F. W. Farrar, who thus describes part of a conversation with Browning soon after the appearance of the second volume of *The Ring and the Book*:

He [Browning] said that when one of his earlier volumes came out—I think, *Bells and Pomegranates*—a copy fell into the hands of Mr John Stuart Mill, who was then at the zenith of his fame, and whose literary opinion was accepted as oracular. Mr J S Mill expressed his admiration of the poems, and of the originality of the lessons they contained, and he wrote to the editor of *Tait's Magazine*, then one of the leading literary journals, asking if he might review them in the forthcoming number. The editor wrote back to say that he should always esteem it an honor and an advantage to receive a review from the pen of Mr J S Mill, but unfortunately he could not insert a review of *Bells and Pomegranates*, as it had been reviewed in the last number. Mr Browning had the curiosity to look at the last number of the magazine, and there read the so-called review. It was as follows "*Bells and Pomegranates*, by Robert Browning. *Balderdash*."⁵

Had the Dean examined the "so-called review," he would have found that the volume it noticed was not *Bells and Pomegranates*, but *Pauline*; and he would also have learned that it characterized the poem not as "*Balderdash*," but as "a piece of pure bewilderment,"⁶ which is presumably the "flippant line" that forestalled Mill's review. It would appear, therefore, that the "Review" to which Browning alluded was not the *Examiner*, but *Tait's Magazine*.

Elsewhere in his chapter on Browning, Farrar quotes the poet's

⁴ Bridell-Fox, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

⁵ F. W. Farrar, *Men I Have Known* (New York, 1897), pp. 64-65. In a footnote Farrar adds. "Such was the poet's recollection; the exact word, however, may not have been 'Balderdash,' but something equally contemptuous, and possibly the reminiscence was a little blurred" (*Ibid.*, p. 65). Cf. also Gosse (*op. cit.*, p. 193) for a passage very similar to that quoted above. Internal evidence indicates that Gosse drew the materials for his account of *Pauline* directly from Browning himself.

⁶ Cf. *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*, III (Aug., 1833), 668.

opinion of the *Tait* notice, as related to him in the course of their conversation. According to the Dean, Browning said

"It depended, you see, on what looked like the merest accident, whether the work of a new or as yet almost unknown writer should receive an appreciative review from the pen of the first literary and philosophic critic of his day,—a review which would have rendered him most powerful help, exactly at the time when it was most needed,—or whether he should only receive one insolent epithet from some nameless nobody. I consider that this so called 'review' retarded any recognition of me by twenty years' delay."

Now it is well known that Browning not only had read Mill's notes on *Pauline*, but had annotated them.⁸ Hence his assumption that an article built on these notes would have been "appreciative" is surprising, since the comments taken as a whole, and particularly the summary remarks, were by no means favorable. Mill himself was aware of this, for in returning his copy of the poem to Fox in June, 1833, he wrote: "I send *Pauline* having done all I could, which was to annotate copiously in the margin and sum up on the fly-leaf. On the whole the observations are not flattering to the author—perhaps too strong in the expression to be shown him."⁹ Nor would this note seem to bear out Browning's belief that the Mill review would "have rendered him most powerful help" at a crucial period in his career. It probably would have had quite the opposite effect. Conjecture apart, one thing is plain. None of the available facts justifies Browning's interpretation of Mill's notes on *Pauline*. And in the face of these facts, it would appear that the *Tait* "review," in precluding the article based on the notes, did not retard Browning's fame.

LEWIS F. HAINES

University of Florida

⁸ Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 65. It is hardly necessary to point out that in the conversation, as reported by Farrar, Browning exaggerated Mill's reputation as a critic. On Mill's critical standing at the time he wrote his review of *Pauline*, see Griffin and Minchin, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

⁹ See Phelps, *op. cit.*, pp. 296-298.

^{*} Quoted by Mary Dean Rensan, *loc. cit.*

SPENSER'S LUCIFERA AND PHILOTIME

It seems to have escaped notice that the same chapter of *Natalis Comes' Mythologia* in which Britomartis is mentioned (III, xviii) provided Spenser with the name *Lucifera*, which he applies to the goddess of pride (*F. Q.*, I, iv). Comes lists it as a name for the moon:

Atque cum Luna lumine luceat alieno, iure Solis & crassioris materiae
fiha esse dicitur Dicta est viarum & montium esse custos, quoniam via-
toribus lumen praebeat per noctem, quare etiam *Lucifera* vocata est

This is probably Spenser's source for the name, but it provides only a few hints for his *Lucifera*. The reference to "alien light" with which the moon shines is apparently echoed in stanzas 8 and 9, where we are told that *Lucifera* shines like the sun, or rather like Phaethon, who assumed the vesture and chariot of the sun, which did not properly belong to him. The implication is that the goddess' splendor is "alien" and not naturally her own, a show of brightness without its reality. Comes' phrase may have suggested this treatment

Comes' description of the moon as the daughter of the sun and "crasser matter" may have suggested *Lucifera's* pretensions to high birth in stanza 11. She is the offspring of Pluto and Proserpina. Since they were sometimes considered to preside over Chaos, the world of unformed matter (Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae*, I, 26-27), we have in them a certain correspondence to Comes' "crasser matter." *Lucifera* wishes to forget this part of her parentage and to appear as the daughter of Jove.

The name of the goddess Philotime, with whom Mammon tempts Guyon, has not been traced to a definite source, though it obviously signifies "love of honor." Spenser may have borrowed the word from Aquinas' *Summa Theologica* (Pt. II of First Part, Q. 60, A. 5). Aquinas is drawing fine distinctions among the several moral virtues, any of which may become vices if not controlled and directed by reason. Virtues, he says, may be classified according to the objects with which they are concerned and also according to the point of view from which we approach those objects. For instance, if wealth is considered as an object of desire or pleasure or love, the proper virtue concerning it is *Liberalty*; but if wealth is con-

sidered as an object of hope, as a difficult quest to be achieved, the proper virtue is Magnificence. If honor is considered as an object of desire or pleasure or love, the proper virtue is Philotimia; if honor is considered as an object of hope, as a quest difficult of attainment, the proper virtue is Magnanimity. It appears that Liberality and Philotimia have to do with the concupiscible part of the soul, while Magnificence and Magnanimity have to do with the irascible part.

We may now observe the significance of Guyon's first two temptations. As indicated by Spenser in stanza 64, the sin of yielding would not consist in the possession of wealth or honor, but rather in the intemperate desire for more than is necessary or fitting. When Guyon is tempted with wealth, he declares that his interests are centered rather upon honor to be obtained through deeds of arms (st. 33). Accordingly, Mammon tempts him to an inordinate love of honor in the person of Philotime. Here Guyon again refuses, professing humility and betrothal to another maiden. His virtue consists in refraining from *excessive* love of honor. To love Philotime, or honor, within reason is a virtue, but to break his troth or to plight it for the sake of self-advancement is to become in fact dishonorable through the intemperate pursuit of honor.

According to Aquinas' explanation, both the temperate and the intemperate love of wealth and honor pertain to the concupiscible faculty in so far as they involve self-gratification of desire. Hence Guyon, the knight of temperance, exercises rational control over concupiscent desires and indulges them only so far as is fitting. But where honor and wealth are regarded as means to an end and not as ends in themselves, where the glory of the quest is more important than possession of the objects pursued, their pursuit pertains to the irascible faculty, and the proper virtues concerned with them are Magnanimity and Magnificence. Spenser states in his letter to Raleigh that Prince Arthur is intended to exemplify Magnificence, in which the poet seems to include Magnanimity, since he purports to follow Aristotle, who lists these two as the foremost of the virtues (*Nic. Eth.*, iv). We may accordingly assume that Prince Arthur illustrates the proper use of the irascible faculty, while Guyon illustrates the proper use of the concupiscible faculty. This treatment may have been suggested by Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*, in explaining the allegory of which the author represents

Godfrey and Rinaldo as types of the rational and irascible faculties of the mind.

It is rather striking that Spenser should select love of wealth and love of honor as the two temptations to which Guyon is submitted in the lower world. The third temptation of the golden apples is not clear, unless it represents a combination of the first two, the apples representing wealth in that they are of gold, and honor in that one of them was the coveted prize of beauty in Paris' judgment of the three goddesses. In Aquinas, also, wealth and honor are selected as representative objects of temptation out of the large number of possible objects that might have been used. This use of the same two objects around which virtue and vice may be determined by temperance or excess, together with Aquinas' prominent use of Philotimia, leads me to believe that Spenser may have drawn his Philotime from this particular passage.

JOHN E HANKINS

University of Kansas

A NOTE ON THE FORMATION OF PRETERIT-PRESENT VERBS

A small and highly important group of verbs in English is known as preterit- (or preteritive-) present or strong-weak verbs. These verbs have gained their name because "the present tense . . . of each of them is, in form, a strong preterit, the old present having been displaced by the new. They all have weak preterits"¹ It has generally been assumed that in some mysterious fashion the old preterits acquired present meaning and that after that the original presents were lost and new weak preterits formed from the stem of the old preterit plural. About the only attempt at explanation is that of Curme:

Originally the past tense had close relations to the present, much as the present perfect . . . today, so that it pointed not only to the past but also to the present. In course of time the past tense became the tense of narrative, pointing purely and simply to the past without reference to the present. Thus in the course of development of most verbs the past idea

¹ C. Alphonso Smith, *Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Exercise Book* (4th ed., Boston, 1903), p. 91.

in the past tense overshadowed that of the present, which was once also present there. In a few verbs, however, the opposite development took place—the idea of the present in the past tense overshadowed that of the past, which was once also present there, so that these forms are now felt as present tenses. In the prehistoric period after these old strong past tenses had come to be felt as present tenses, new weak past tenses were coined for reference to the past.²

Although Curme argues ably for this point of view and gives illustrations of how the idea of the present could be felt in the past tenses of some of the most important preterit-present verbs of Old and Modern English, one feels that too much has to be assumed and that the whole process is somewhat too mystical to account for the phenomena of preterit-present verbs.

It seems at least possible that the grammarians have been approaching the problem from the wrong point of view, in assuming that first the old preterit acquired present meaning, that secondly the old present was dropped, and that lastly the new weak preterit was developed or, to use Curme's word, coined. May it not be that the weak-analogy preterit came first? The operation of the principle of analogy, by which many strong verbs have become weak, is well known.³ It is not illogical to suppose that those who used Prehistoric Old English or Primitive Germanic (for grammarians have placed the origin of the preterit-present in both these periods) were subject to the same tendency to regularity that has marked the human mind in periods for which we have more exact data. To give an illustration of the manner in which the preterit-present may well have developed, I shall borrow a favorite phrase from the vocabulary of the four-year-old daughter of a colleague,⁴ who, when she has

² George O. Curme, *Parts of Speech and Accidence* (Boston, 1935, Vol. II, Kurath and Curme, *A Grammar of the English Language*), p. 252.

³ On this point, see, *i a*, Albert C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language* (New York, 1935), pp. 199-203, dealing particularly with the Middle English period, and Charles Mackay, "Lost Preterites," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, CVI, 257-278 (September, 1869).

⁴ It has often been noticed that children are extremely logical in their use of language and display the tendency to regularity very markedly. Especially interesting is the study of Alexander F. Chamberlain, "Preterite-Forms, Etc., in the Language of English-Speaking Children," *MLN.*, XXI, 42-44 (Feb., 1906). Chamberlain observed the speech of his own daughter and noted the forms which occurred in fifty-five different verbs. The most common error was the use of weak-analogy preterites for strong verbs (bited, buyed, *e g.*)

been told something that she has heard before, will say, "I *knewed* it all the time" The child mind—and the mind of the primitive speaker is not altogether unchildlike—realizes that it has heard *knew* as the preterit of *know*, but, feeling that there is something queer about a preterit which does not end in *-ed*, adds the required suffix.⁵ If this speaker were living before the days of printing or went uncorrected in her speech, the next logical step would be to use *knewed* (*knewed* without the preterit suffix) for the present tense. The old present *know* would soon drop out as not belonging in the regular *knew-knewed* series. In the absence of more complete studies of preterit-presents and of dated manuscripts showing their evolution, consideration should be given to the possibility that the preterit-present verbs were formed in such a way.

ALBERT FRANK GEGENHEIMER

University of Connecticut

PEARL LERE LEKE, 210

Pearl, 210, may be translated in several ways without emendation—though emendation to date has been its lot.¹ The poet, having completed an account of the vision-maiden's dress (193-204), describes in detail her crown, her facial expression, her hair:

A pȳt coroune zet wer þar gyrlē,
Of mariorys & non oþer ston,
Hiȝe pynakled, of cler quyt perle,

⁵ Chamberlain, *op cit.*, p 44, noted *blewed*, *helded*, and *tookt* among the forms used by his daughter. He pointed out that Wright's *EDD* "records . . . nearly all the forms listed in this note. The common speech of the unlettered adult and that of the young child are here, as in many other cases, parallel" Wright also gives *knewed* and another analogous form, *flewed*.

¹ Richard Morris and Israel Gollancz in their editions of *The Pearl* emend, [*h*]ere [*h*]eke; C. G. Osgood, [*h*]ere-leke; E. V. Gordon and C. T. Onions, [*h*]ere leke, "Notes on the Text and Interpretation of *Pearl*," *Medium Aevum*, II, 165. All refer the phrase to the maiden's hair, but that is described in 213. G. G. Coulton (trans. 1906) very freely renders 209-210:

Nought else upon her hair's fair curl,
Which hung in locks her neck adown.

Wyth flurtd flowre3 perfet vpon
 To hed hade ho non oþer werle—
 Her lere leke al hyr vmbe gon 210
 Her semblaunt sade for doc oþer erle,
 Her ble more blagt þen whalle3 bon
 As schorne gold schyr her fax þenne schon,
 On schyldere3 þat leghe vnlapped lyzte,
 Her depe color 3et wonted non
 Of precios perle in porfyl pyzte.

The picture proceeds logically from the crown upon her head to her face—*lere*, OE. *hleor*. *Leke* may be a form of *lake*, 'fine linen.' This possibility gives the translation:

Her face linen (i.e., her wimple) all about her gone

Gon must be either infinitive, the third plural present, or the past participle. In 63 and 376 of the poem it is the past participle. The form used for the third plural present in the poem is *got3*.

A second possibility is that *leke* means 'look, aspect,' OE. *lec*, ON. *leke*.

The look of her countenance gone all around her

That is, she was irradiated by her countenance. Radiation of light from the countenance is frequently mentioned as a characteristic of heavenly apparitions. A similar sense may be deduced through derivation of *leke* from the ON. substantive *leikr* related to the verb *leika*, which is represented in OE. by *lacan*, 'to flash, to flicker,' as in *Daniel* 475, *lacende lg*, 'flickering flame.'² OE. *lacan* would seem in this meaning—as in its original meaning 'to move up and down, to leap, to jump, etc.'—to be a literal translation of the Latin *coruscare*, and probably in its derived meaning also to have followed the development of the Latin verb. Another translation, then, of 210—without emendation of the manuscript reading—would be,

Her radiance of face diffused about her.

SISTER MARY VINCENT HILLMANN

College of Saint Elizabeth
 Convent Station, New Jersey

²*Junius Manuscript* (ed. Krapp), New York, 1931.

NOTES ON SOME PHYSICAL TERMS IN THE *NED.* CORRIGENDA

An examination of the *Experimental Researches in Electricity*¹ by Michael Faraday will indicate that the definitions of anode and cathode given by the *NED.* and credited to Faraday are not those actually given by him. For anode the *NED.* states: "(a) *strictly* as applied by Faraday the path by which an electric current leaves the positive pole and enters the electrolyte, on its way to the negative pole." The *NED.* does not give a reference to Faraday's works, where the term was first used in 1834, but gives its first reference of 1849 to Russell and Woolrich.² In Section 663 of Volume 1 of Faraday's work we have the statement "The surface, at which according to common phraseology, the electric current enters and leaves a decomposing body, are most important places of action, and require to be distinguished from the poles. . . ." Later in the same Section he states as follows: "The anode is therefore that surface at which the electric current, according to our present expression, enters the decomposing body." Likewise the *NED.* gives the definition of cathode as "(a) the path by which an electric current leaves the electrolyte and passes into the negative pole." Here, however, *NED.* gives a reference to Faraday's work of 1834 which states as follows: "The cathode is that surface at which the current leaves the decomposing body, and is its positive extremity. . . ." It is quite obvious that Faraday conceived of both anode and cathode as "a surface" and not as "a path."

Again *NED.*'s definition for anion, cation and ion seems to be open to criticism. *NED.* states, in the case of anion, the following: "The name given by Faraday to an electro-magnetic element which in electro-chemical decomposition is evolved at the anode." For the cation we only need to change the last word in the above definition to cathode and for ion *NED.* states: ". . . either of the elements

¹ Michael Faraday, *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, 1 (London, 1839), pp 166-7.

² The present writer has been unable to locate the reference to Russell and Woolrich. Although Faraday's composite works were not published until 1839, the papers were read before the Royal Society early in 1834. Also see *Faraday's Diary*, ed Thomas Martin, II, p. 272 (London, 1932).

which pass to the 'poles' or electrodes in electrolysis . ." In place of the word "elements" Faraday uses "bodies"³ The technical term "element" might imply that the electrolyte was always broken down into two of the class of substances which cannot be separated into substances of other kinds. This is definitely not the case when sulphuric acid is used as the electrolyte. Upon electrolysis this electrolyte is broken down into hydrogen and an acid radical. This radical is not an element in the technical sense of the word.

A. W. RICHESON

University of Maryland, Baltimore

REVIEWS

The Genres of Parnassian Poetry A Study of the Parnassian Minors By AARON SCHAFER. Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1944. Pp. 427. \$4.00.

M. Schaffer a consacré plus de quinze ans de sa vie à l'étude du groupe parnassien. Il y fallait un courage intrépide, car jamais, sauf au dix-huitième siècle, la poésie mineure n'a été en France aussi monotone et plate. Dans ce gros ouvrage, véritable somme de ses patientes recherches, M. Schaffer déploie une érudition qui est vaste, solide et précise; il utilise avec discernement les travaux critiques antérieurs, tout en indiquant à l'occasion leurs insuffisances comme pour mieux justifier sa propre entreprise; il fixe maint point de détail sur la vie et l'œuvre d'une soixantaine de poètes souvent obscurs et cite de nombreux échantillons de leurs vers, médiocrement édifiants pour l'amateur de poésie, il faut l'avouer. Tant de labeur n'est pas inutile; les résultats sont pourtant un peu minces. Le livre aurait gagné en intérêt si l'auteur avait procédé avec moins de sécheresse dans ses analyses, avec moins de timidité dans ses appréciations esthétiques, et s'il avait mieux dégagé de son étude les conclusions d'ordre général auxquelles devraient conduire tous les travaux de quelque ampleur sur des auteurs de second ordre.

Quelques noms de poètes qui méritent d'être appelés parnassiens, au même titre que bien d'autres ici examinés, manquent à ce consciencieux dictionnaire des petits poètes du milieu du dix-neuvième

³ Faraday, *Researches*, loc. cit., p. 198.

siècle. Amédée Renée, dont les *Heures de Poésie* valent l'*Onyx* de Charles Coran; Philoxène Boyer et Alexis Martin, collaborateurs du premier *Parnasse*, Arsène Houssaye, Edouard Grenier, dont les trois volumes de vers publiés par Lemerre renferment mainte courte pièce à côté de longs poèmes narratifs et dramatiques, André Lefèvre, auteur de *La Flûte de Pan*, et à nos yeux l'un des esprits les plus vigoureux de cette génération; enfin Anatole France, certainement plus parnassien dans ses vers que Paul Bourget, son cadet de huit ans, ici étudié, et Jules Lemaitre, dont le volume de vers est parnassien à la Sully-Prudhomme.

L'auteur aurait pu se contenter d'adopter l'ordre alphabétique pour classer ses notices sur ces poètes et versificateurs. Il a préféré les grouper par genres: descriptif, philosophique, antique et exotique, satanique, anacréontique et funambulesque, réaliste et régional, sentimental. Il a voulu par là montrer la variété des thèmes traités par cette "école," qui ne fut guère plus unie dans l'orthodoxie que le romantisme ou le symbolisme. Mais un tel ordre ne va pas sans redites ou sans artifice; surtout, il fait ressortir avec cruauté, à la fin de chaque chapitre, la banalité des conclusions. On attendrait en effet de la longue enquête de M. Schaffer des réponses à bien des questions que se pose tout étudiant de la poésie parnassienne: quelle fut sur ces poètes l'influence de leurs prédécesseurs du début du siècle (Chénier, Vigny, Hugo)? eurent-ils une attitude philosophique ou religieuse à peu près uniforme? quels sont les caractères communs à leur pessimisme, à leur nostalgie du passé ou de l'ailleurs, à leur exotisme? en quoi leur esthétique se rattache-t-elle à celle de Gautier, de Leconte de Lisle, de Banville? Dans la forme, à côté du calcul arithmétique des rimes riches, auquel M. Schaffer se livre superstitieusement, on aurait aimé à voir la virtuosité de ces ouvriers du vers appréciée, comparée à celle des Romantiques ou des Symbolistes: quel emploi ont-ils fait des assonances ou des sonorités, du rejet, du trimètre combiné avec le tétramètre, d'adjectifs évocateurs? Pourquoi leurs images restent-elles si désespérément denuées de la "sorcellerie évocatoire" chère à Baudelaire? Le célèbre reproche de Mallarmé dans sa réponse à l'enquête de Jules Huret (que la poésie parnassienne ne sait pas suggérer) est-il justifié? M. Schaffer pouvait répondre à ces questions et à d'autres, puisqu'il avait lu de près ce que lisent fort peu de gens. Avec un peu plus de hardiesse dans ses vues, il aurait pu, sinon réhabiliter le Parnasse, montrer du moins que ces consciencieux artisans, et quelques maîtres parmi eux, ont joué un rôle précieux dans la poésie du siècle dernier. Albert Thibaudet s'est plu à soutenir que Mallarmé et Valéry étaient, par bien des côtés, les fils du Parnasse. André Gide, dans ses *Prétextes*, définit même l'auteur de l'*Hérodiade* comme "le représentant dernier et le plus parfait du Parnasse, son sommet, son accomplissement et sa consommation." Il est de fait que Mallarmé—ses *Divagations* le proclament—"vova à Banville un culte" et que son plus intime

correspondant fut Henri Cazals (voir les deux récents volumes du Dr. Mondor) Il y a, chez Baudelaire, plus de Parnassisme qu'on ne le dit souvent. Une classification plus chronologique de ces poètes par générations successives aurait permis à M. Schaffer de montrer que le Parnasse était loin d'être mort en 1885 beaucoup de *minores*, au temps du symbolisme et depuis, diffèrent peu des petits Parnassiens universitaires comme Ernest Dupuy, Auguste Angellier, Pierre de Nolhac, ciseleurs du vers comme Pierre Quillard, Pierre Louys, Henri de Régner lui-même à partir des *Médailles d'Argile*, poètes méridionaux au verbe coloré et à l'imagination glacée comme Laurent Tailhade, Emmanuel Signoret, Raymond de la Tailhède, Charles Maurras.

Envisagé d'un certain jour, le Parnasse apparaît comme l'expression, au milieu du dix-neuvième siècle, de l'une des constantes de la poésie française, et peut-être son péril le plus perfide (poésie oratoire ou plate, malhabile à évoquer avec des sons, accordant peu aux valeurs de chant, éloignée de toute source populaire) Mais chez des artistes mieux doués, le Parnasse aide la poésie française à éviter les dangers plus graves encore de la sensiblerie vulgaire, du préraphaélisme étheré, de l'angélisme fade et de l'amphigourisme prétentieux. Après la base solide et consciencieuse qu'a fournie M. Schaffer, souhaitons que l'histoire littéraire américaine, et peut-être M. Schaffer lui-même, ose proposer une appréciation littéraire et esthétique de ce mouvement poétique et montre ainsi que l'étude de modestes *minores* peut-être fertile et suggestive.

HENRI PEYRE

Yale University

Irish Poetry from the English Invasion to 1798. By RUSSELL K. ALSPACH. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943. Pp. ix + 146. \$1.75.

Mr. Alspach's ambitious little volume attempts to discuss in less than 130 of its pages the Anglo-Irish poetry of more than six centuries. For the most part it makes attractive reading. But from the outset it raises the question of terminology. To begin with, in spite of the elaborate defense of the title in the Preface, it seems (to this reviewer at least) that the term "Irish poetry" is a misnomer, and that Seymour and Law and the Cambridge History of English Literature, in preferring to write of "Anglo-Irish literature," offer a more authoritative precedent than do Andrew Malone and Stephen Gwynn. Mr. Alspach runs into frequent inconsistency, therefore, when he is forced to refer (p. 27) to the "translation of an Irish song into English" or (p. 108) to "the Irish line 'Vurneen deelish vaal ma chree.'" In the second

place, we are confronted with the question of how much of this "Irish poetry" is worthy of being called "poetry" at all. It is clear from only a cursory reading that if Mr. Alspach had rigidly excluded "verse," his volume would be slenderer than it is. We frequently come upon such comments as "Neither poem is of any particular worth" (p. 20), "it is possible to go through [Dermody's two volumes] without stumbling on anything that even faintly resembles poetry" (p. 54), and "not the slightest originality of structure or diction is shown" (p. 114). Few and far between are the exceptions like the stanza "Icham of Irlaunde," which has "a freshness and charm that are not elsewhere in the early poetry" (p. 23). Obviously Mr. Alspach's criticism rewards the reader far more than the run of the poems themselves possibly could.

The bilingual problem is in part solved by a twofold division into Part I, "The Poetry," and Part II, "The Matter of Ireland." Under these heads there appears to be a certain amount of overlapping, as, for example, when English translations from the Gaelic, which are properly the province of Part II, are also discussed (e. g., pp. 27-28) in Part I. The author tells us that he has "tried to be complete—that is, to discuss, or at least mention all extant Irish poetry—up to 1700," but that he has "not tried to be complete for the period from 1700 to 1798." It seems safe to assume that if by "poetry" we do not merely mean "verse," Mr. Alspach has succeeded in covering the ground he has mapped out for himself before 1700. Regardless of completeness, his treatment of the later period is somewhat less satisfactory.

The chief weaknesses of this interesting survey, both of error¹ and of omission, are traceable to the author's unfamiliarity with the Gaelic background. Among the poems in English "inspired by Ireland or its people" which were certainly written before 1798 I find no reference to a number, including the following:

The English elegies for Donough Macnamara, d. 1692, and Roger O'Shaughnessy, d. 1690 (Abbott and Gwynn, *Catalogue*, pp. 291-92).

The well-known poem on Ireland ascribed to the Irish St. Donatus (Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, p. 601; Dinneen and O'Donoghue, *The Poems of Egan O'Rahilly*, 2d ed., 1911, pp. 34-37). The English version

¹ Misprints are numerous in Part II. for *Conall*, *Cernach* (p 70) read *Conall Cernach*, for *Daly* (pp 82, 104, 134, passim) read *O'Daly*; for *Dineen* (pp 94, 142, passim) read *Dinneen*, for *Kenny* (p 138) read *Kenney*, for *M'Louchlan* (p 120) read *M'Lauchlan*, etc. Delete *Kittredge*, G L, . 1896 (p 138) and insert instead (p 137) *Furnivall, F J, Early English Poems and Lives of Saints, Berlin, 1862*, and revise note 29, p 14. The Index is far from serviceable, readers should not be expected to look for *Conall Cernach*, whose name means "Conall the Victorious," under the epithet *Cernach*, or *Giraldus* the Welshman under the epithet *Cambrensis*, or *Grey* under *de Wilton*, or the two *Cormacs* and *Goll* under the epithet *Conlongeas* or *MacArt* (recte *Mac Art*) and *Mac Morna*.

beginning "Far westward lies an Isle of Antient Fame," of which no less than six MS copies exist, is at least as early as 1767, and perhaps much earlier.

John O'Connell's much-copied lament for Ireland (121 stanzas), of which at least three English versions appeared before 1798. The first begins

When the Irish Heroes I behold dismayed,
Our Country pillaged and our Church decayed (c 1780-83),

the second "When the brave Irish chiefs I call to mind" (March, 1788). The third, beginning "Irish heroes when I remind," can be dated as early as 1790

"My Love is Like the Sun." See note in Padraic Colum, *Anthology of Irish Verse* (1922), p. 345.

"The Charms of Limerick," before 1768 (Not to be confused with the trivial stanzas entitled "The Praise of Limerick," c. 1757, printed in Croker's *Popular Songs of Ireland*, p. 240)

John O'Brien's 14-stanza poem, "Ye noble natives of our Irish Isle," appeared before 1710. It was translated into Irish by Hugh MacCurtin early in the eighteenth century.

Mathew Fitzsimons' poem (about 1750) beginning "Three foes I have, impatient for my death," translated from the Irish. Cf. Wells, *Manual*, pp. 388-9, for English treatments of the theme.

"The Shannon's Praise," a poem of 87 lines in heroic couplets, before 1716

"The Exiled Irishman's Lamentation," beginning "Green were the hills (*al.* fields) where my forefathers dwelt," which found at least three early translators into Irish.

And certainly a book on this subject published within sound of the Liberty Bell should not fail to mention the eighteenth-century translations into English from the Gaelic of Thomas O'Meehan, whose praises of George Washington have not gone unpublished (G. L. Kittredge, *Publ. of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XIII, 254-59; F. N. Robinson, *ibid.*, XVIII, 201-06).

ROLAND M. SMITH

The University of Illinois

Wordsworth's Formative Years. By GEORGE WILBUR MEYER. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1943. Pp. vii + 265. \$3.50.

This important study of the most obscure period of Wordsworth's life is in several respects unique. Unlike other biographies, it makes

no use of *The Prelude* as source material. Professor Meyer believes that Wordsworth's great poem is unreliable in fact and in interpretation, and he quotes it almost solely to expose its inaccuracies. Deprived of this tempting source of information and quotation, he subjects the other relevant material to a thorough and thoughtful analysis. The result is a very considerable gain for scholarship. In no earlier study has there been such a clear revelation of the continuity of Wordsworth's thought during the formative years, nor has the mind that was at work in the early poems been brought previously into such sharp focus.

One can be sure, however, that more than one of Professor Meyer's conclusions will be challenged, because the book bristles with controversy. The author disagrees with almost all the recognized authorities on the period, such as Legouis, De Selincourt, Harper, Garrod, Mueschke, and Campbell. Among the somewhat startling conclusions reached are the following: that *An Evening Walk* and *Descriptive Sketches* proceeded from the unhappiness felt by William and Dorothy Wordsworth at having no normal domestic existence, that the transformation of Wordsworth's Revolutionary zeal into flaming hatred for England was due to the economic and legal frustrations which he experienced in 1793, that Coleridge did not provide Wordsworth with a philosophy and poetic aims, but that by 1795 Wordsworth had in large measure formulated both; that the moral crisis described in *The Prelude*, x, A 873-901, is fictitious, that instead of being an attack upon Godwin, *The Borderers* is an unmistakable affirmation of some of his most prominent ideas, that Hartley's doctrine of benevolence exerted a more important influence upon Wordsworth than did "associationism" or the idea of the "three ages." (This list could easily be expanded to three times its present length.)

This is not the place to evaluate the conclusions of such a controversial book, but it may be well to observe that some of Professor Meyer's objections to *The Prelude* are based, not upon the text, but upon the commentary. For example, he begins his book by quoting the account of Wordsworth's "dedication" given in iv, A 329-45, and then observes that the account is misleading. Close scrutiny of the lines, he says, reveals that they reflect Wordsworth's conviction that "his progress and development in poetry were guaranteed by the intelligent intervention of some friendly power." Still closer scrutiny of the lines reveals that Wordsworth neither said nor implied anything about poetry, or a poetic career.

Professor Meyer's case against the "legendary" moral crisis of the nineties is based in part upon the dubious supposition, unwarranted either by Wordsworth or by modern psychiatry, that while this "disease" was running its course, the poet could not have been capable of good spirits, pleasant social intercourse, or the composition of good verse.

But despite these and other points to which there will be objection, it must be conceded that on a surprising number of issues the burden of proof now rests, for the time being at least, not upon Professor Meyer, but upon the opposition.

JOHN QUINCY WOLF, JR.

Southwestern at Memphis

The Writings of Arthur Hallam Now First Collected and Edited by T. H. VAIL MOTTER. New York. Modern Language Association of America. London Oxford University Press, 1943. Pp. xiv + 332. \$3.50.

"To know Arthur Hallam is to know Tennyson." Many critics have said so, but few of them have ever troubled to learn more about the "friend" of *In Memoriam* than can be found in the *Remains*, edited with many suppressions by Henry Hallam, the father, in 1834. The *Poems* of 1830 have been almost unread. The one reasonably full treatment of Arthur Hallam as a man and as a writer is Dr. John Brown's essay in the *North British Review* in 1851, and Brown apparently never knew the *Poems*. Thus we have remained surprisingly ignorant of one who might be expected to arouse our curiosity.

Professor Motter's admirable edition of Hallam's writings—one hundred thirteen poems and ten essays—is therefore a welcome book. Half the prose and nearly two-thirds of the verse now printed were omitted from the *Remains* and are for the first time generally available. The poems, edited against all available manuscripts, are in chronological order. The editorial comment is concise and intelligent. As the editor admits, these poems will not give Hallam rank as a poet; but they do reveal the mind and spirit that powerfully affected Alfred Tennyson. Among much of interest, the most important prose essay is the "Theodiceæ Novissima," read by Hallam to the Apostles at Cambridge in 1831. Printed at Tennyson's insistence in the *Remains* of 1834 but suppressed in subsequent editions by Henry Hallam (though it was reprinted in 1869), it is almost unknown to students of literature. Professor Karl Young some years ago at Stanford analysed its significance, but his paper was never published. Now the 'Theodiceæ Novissima,' in this new edition, should be required reading for any serious student of *In Memoriam*.

Professor Motter prints for the first time twenty-five sonnets translated by Hallam from the *Vita Nuova*. These, with some of the prose criticism on Dante, suggest that not the least of the influences Hallam had on Tennyson was that of a short life 'uni-

fied by a single pursuit of the love of God through embracing the love of man.' And Hallam owed much to the Dante who at the end of a long quest thought he saw within his final vision of the divine light the lineaments, at least, of a human face. As Professor Motter indicates, Hallam's early death cost the Victorians a critic whose knowledge of Italian writers might have counterbalanced some of the emphasis the leadership of Coleridge and Carlyle gave to things German. The four essays on Italian subjects are not the least part of this carefully prepared book that makes us look forward to Professor Motter's biography of Hallam.

HOWARD F. LOWBY

Princeton University

Stephen Gosson: a Biographical and Critical Study. By WILLIAM RINGLER. Princeton. Princeton University Press, 1942. Pp. viii + 151. \$2 00. (Princeton Studies in English, 25.)

In his book *Stephen Gosson*, Mr. Ringler has set a fine standard for a balanced, and also critical study of a minor literary figure. He makes no claims for greatness which can not be substantiated, and he has not permitted the time devoted to the study of such a man as Gosson to blind him to his subject's limitations. To quote Mr. Ringler: "Gosson represents, not the England of the Earls of Oxford and Essex, of exquisite gentlemen and daring soldiers, but the England of the steady, sober, God-fearing merchants and artisans who were slowly bringing about a new order." Gosson emerges from this study as not only an interesting middle-class figure but also a significant one in the realm of literary history.

To the skeleton outline of the life in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, much new material has been added. Even so our knowledge of Gosson is limited, but Mr. Ringler has accomplished the difficult task of showing us Gosson through his relationship to his contemporaries such as Thomas Lodge, John Florio, Anthony Munday, and John Rainolds, his Oxford teacher.

In addition to its value as a source of much factual material about Stephen Gosson, his work, his style, his sources, and the many attacks on the stage, this book is significant because of the way in which the emphasis in each chapter is focused on important problems which every Elizabethan scholar needs to consider or reconsider. 1) The influence of the type of education received at the universities. Mr. Ringler shows clearly that Stephen Gosson's Euphuistic prose style bears undeniably the mark of his teacher John Rainolds. The organization and the content of the *Schoole of Abuse* and the *Ephemerides* follow the general pattern of academic themes and exercises. Gosson's reading never seems to have gone very far beyond the works popular at Oxford, and the general

tone of moral seriousness and the view of life which he supported was one which was current at the University in his day. 2) The clergyman as a moral force in his day. As a successful preacher Gosson seems to have exerted considerable force in the general reform by bringing theological argument to support the practical claims made against the theatres. Many clerics brought their influence to bear in this fight. 3) The problems in the attacks on the stage in the sixteenth century. "The early attack on the stage was not brought about by external forces such as the rise to prominence of the Puritans, but was caused by the development of certain objectional conditions, resulting from the commercialization of the drama, within the theatres themselves. Furthermore early hostility to the theatre was motivated quite as much by political, economic and sanitary conditions as it was by religious and moral prejudice." Mr. Ringler discusses Gosson's part in this attack in the light of these statements. 4) The relationship of the *Schoole of Abuse* to the sixteenth-century critical essay. After giving a most plausible explanation for Gosson's dedicating his two works to Sir Philip Sidney and of Edmund Spenser's account of the latter's scorn, Mr. Ringler states that Gosson was "unintentionally responsible for provoking the most important critical essay of his century."

The notes in this book are particularly full and valuable, and the two detailed appendices list the old and new biographical documents and give a complete and corrected bibliography of Stephen Gosson's writings.

There may be many reasons for selecting the photo offset process for producing an inexpensive book whose appeal is to a limited group of readers, but the results never seem to be satisfactory. It is hard to distinguish the footnotes from the body of the text, the words are often blurred and the general effect is hard on the eyes. I wish that Mr. Ringler had not chosen this process and that he had seen fit to include an index. The author's terse style and neat organization make his study of Stephen Gosson interesting reading, and his sound scholarship makes it valuable.

KATHRINE KOLLER

The University of Rochester

Pleasant Quippes for Upstart Newfangled Gentlewomen. Edited by EDWIN JOHNSTON HOWARD. Oxford, Ohio: The Anchor Press, Pp. xxii + 22. \$1.25.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Collected by ARUNDELL ESDAILE. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Volume xxvi. Pp. 112.

This interesting source of much of our information about Eliza-

bethan costumes and abusive language is here reproduced from the first edition in the H. E. Huntington Library. The editor tells us that the other reprints are incorrect ones, either expurgated or improved by J. Payne Collier's editing. In his explanatory notes Mr. Howard gives a glossary of the terms used in the poem, and in the introduction he describes the various editions of the *Pleasant Quappes*. Collier attempted to assign this anonymous poem to Stephen Gosson by virtue of a signature "Auctore Stephen Gosson" on the title page of the 1596 edition in Alleyn's College of God's Gift Library. Mr. Howard refers the reader to Mr. Ringler's treatment of this point in his book, *Stephen Gosson*, in which he proves the signature to be a forgery.

The present edition contains facsimile reprints of the title pages of the various 1595 and 1596 editions to be found in the Huntington and the Folger Libraries and in the God's Gift College Library at Dulwich, but the editor has wisely chosen to have the text of the poem printed in modern type. The attractive result should be of value to sixteenth-century scholars.

It is heartwarming to find English scholars continuing to publish the annual volume of *Essays and Studies* in wartime. Although this particular volume does not appear to be as interesting as the previous one, it contains much valuable material which should appeal to a wide range of readers. As usual the essays are written with a command of style that American scholars might well envy and emulate.

The essay on the text of Donne's "Divine Poems" establishes the value of the Dobell manuscript for the earlier version of the poems of 1633. Professor Wyld's study of the aspects of style and idiom of fifteenth-century English prose should interest not only the linguist but also the Spenserian scholar because it suggests how closely Spenser's so-called archaic language resembles the style of the fifteenth-century prose. The relationship of Tennyson's early poetry (before 1844) to nineteenth-century scientific thought has long needed the clear analysis which Mr. Rutland gives. In Tennyson's masterpieces, *Maud* and *In Memoriam*, Mr. Rutland finds the real subject to be the "spiritual evolutionary process in the life of the individual." *The Real Thomas Amory* is a biographical study of a little known figure, which arouses the reader's curiosity. The usual dangers of reading a man's life in his writings do not appear in the case of the author of *John Bunce*. The article on the landscape in Augustan verse raises many questions which the author never attempts to solve. The writer of an essay is not obliged to exhaust his subject, but in this essay the failure to point out the existence of the problem of the relation of this interest in landscapes to the taste of the period, or to the theology, or to eighteenth-century philosophy leaves the reader unsatisfied. The discussion of the poetical miscellanies seems also to be only an introductory examination of a much more detailed subject.

Although the range of material in this volume is wide, it is to be hoped that the next volume will include some studies in critical theory as well

KATHRINE KOLLER

The University of Rochester

Bibliographic Notes. By HALLDÓR HERMANNSSON. (= *Islandica*, Vol. XXIX) Ithaca, N. Y. \$2 00

Under this title the master bibliographer collects four essays dealing with books in Iceland

The first, Book Illustration in Iceland, deals with an art which in his homeland is still in its beginnings, for reasons easily surmised. To judge from the copious illustrations excellently reproduced, only Tryggvi Magnússon shows considerable originality as well as ability, but I have to agree with Hermannsson that his landscapes illustrating the new series of editions published by the Old Icelandic Text Society leave much to be desired

The second study deals with the Titles and Nicknames of Icelandic Books from the oldest times down. One might suggest 'short-names' for 'titles'—mostly of sagas and MS collections, but 'nickname' fits quite well some of the curious and humorous designations given especially the long-winded theological treatises, the catechisms, and other dead stock of later times. Peculiar for Iceland is the term *kver* (from Low Latin *quaternus* 'quire'), which originally meant a pamphlet but gradually, especially as the last element of compounds with the subject matter or the name of the author, has come to signify 'volume' and even, 'collection'.—To the odd appellations of saga titles should be added *Grýla* 'Ogress,' the reported title of the first part of the *Sverris saga*.—Rather terrific seems to us now the use of mythological names for periodicals; among them, by the way, the magazine *Skirnir*, now appearing in its 116th consecutive year and "thus the oldest magazine in the Scandinavian countries"; and one of the oldest in the world, for that matter

In his third paper, Notes on Translations into Icelandic, the author comes to the sobering conclusion that to keep abreast the tiny, but highly literate, nation will have to depend more and more on books in foreign tongues. "Geographically and commercially the Icelanders are drawn to the English speaking peoples, and must be acquainted with the English language. Historically and culturally they are one of the Scandinavian group of nations, and in order to maintain their national entity they must keep in close touch with these nations; hence they must know at least one of the Scandinavian tongues besides their own. In this way it is neces-

sary for them to be in fact trilingual. Whether the Icelandic language can in the long run maintain itself under such conditions only time will show."

The last piece deals with Additions to the Bibliographies of Icelandic Books of the XVIth and XVIIth Centuries; with a chronological list of XVIIth century books

L. M. HOLLANDER

University of Texas

Zola aux Etats-Uns. Par ALBERT J. SALVAN. Providence: Brown University, 1943 Pp. 218. (Brown University Studies, 8)

In this well-documented study Dr. Salvan presents an excellent synthesis of American opinion of Zola during the period 1878-1941. His method was to "... sonder méthodiquement les publics les plus divers par l'étude de leurs porte-parole favoris" (p. 9). However, the bulk of the citations which form the body of evidence is chosen from periodicals catering to a select group of readers, and the 'publics les plus divers' have small representation. Throughout, the author concerns himself rather with critical reaction to Zola's works than with Zola's influence on authors themselves, although he frequently includes brief sketches of contemporary American literature, illustrating realistic or naturalistic tendencies.

The first four chapters, which form the real body of the work, are developed in chronological sequence, treating the periods 1878-1880 (the first introduction of Zola to American readers), 1880-1886 (Dr. Salvan notes in the latter year something of a change toward a more tolerant attitude on the part of some critics), 1886-1903 (marked by growing success of the *Rougon-Macquart* series and by public approbation of Zola's stand in the Dreyfus case), and 1903-1941 (in which Zola is accepted as a world figure and becomes the object of increasingly frequent studies in both academic and critical circles). Much of the substance of these four chapters is provided by the citations, the shorter of which Dr. Salvan has excellently translated into French (he leaves the longer quotations in the original). These citations have a curious similarity of tone because of their similarity of content: nearly every critic attacks Zola not on artistic grounds, but solely as a corrupting force, an 'empoisonneur public.' The familiar charges of insanity and perversion are brought against him, as they were also in France during most of his creative life, and the attacks are so violent and continuous as to justify Dr. Salvan in his conclusion that in America "... il est impossible de dissocier le point de vue de la morale de celui de l'esthétique" (p. 187). Dr. Salvan does not, perhaps, make a strong enough point of the fact that in spite of this chorus of

denigration Zola's works sold and still sell very well indeed, witness the appearance of new translations at frequent intervals

Chapter v, the last chapter of the book, is not quite up to the standard of the first four. Entitled *Esquisse d'une étude d'influence*, it is an over-modest attempt to measure Zola's effect on American novelists, too small in scope and confined exclusively to the standard figures, Hamlin Garland, Stephen Crane, Frank Norris, and Theodore Dreiser. Limitations of space undoubtedly prevented Dr. Salvan from devoting some attention to the authors of the so-called 'hard-boiled' school of literature, to such men as Cain, Faulkner, Farrell, and Steinbeck. By omitting all mention of the contemporary school, he seems to imply that its authors owe nothing to Zola's influence, a conclusion which doubtless Dr. Salvan does not himself entertain.

The critical apparatus is admirably handled throughout. The notes are comprehensive, the index complete and the bibliography well organized. The latter includes a chronological record of translations, an alphabetical list of critical works published in America and another chronological record of periodical studies devoted to Zola.

In sum, the work is a real contribution to the study of critical opinion in America. Its conclusions are solidly based on sound evidence, its organization is well-planned, its expression is always adequate and sometimes brilliant. Dr. Salvan has accomplished his task thoroughly and well.

ROBERT J. NIESS

U S Military Academy

Historia de la literatura dramática cubana. Por JOSÉ JUAN ARROM.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944. Illustrated. 91 pp.
text, 42 pp. bibliographies and index. \$2.50

Sr. Arrom, with commendable restraint, has produced a very readable chronicle of the Cuban stage. The brief text presents in a vivid way the history of the legitimate theatre in Havana, while at the same time introducing in proper perspective all of the outstanding dramatic authors.

In 1776 the first theatre was erected in Havana and from then on its repertoire was kept well supplied by visiting companies of actors from Madrid who presented the same programs they had prepared for the Spanish capital. In 1838 was erected the splendid *Teatro Tacón*, comparable in every respect to the best playhouses of Europe. Despite the popularity of the theatre in Cuba, the colony did not produce any original playwrights of note until after the erection of the *Tacón* in 1838. The first romantic play to be

staged in Cuba was presented the same year—*Guillermo* by José María de Andueza, a Spanish-born resident of Havana. Several other Cuban romantic dramatists stand out. Francisco Javier Foxá, whose *Don Pedro de Castilla*, having caused riots between Cubans and Spaniards, had to be suppressed after two performances, José Jacinto Milanés, whose play, *El conde de Alarcos*, drew the praise of no less a personage than Hartzenbusch, and Joaquín Lorenzo Luaces, who is remembered for his rather far-fetched drama of Scotland's Stuarts, *El mendigo rojo*, and for his *Aristodemo*, of subtle anti-clerical tendency.

Writers for the legitimate theatre in Havana worked under some severe handicaps. One was the rigorous censorship exercised by the Spanish authorities all during the century because of their continuing fear of independence movements. The stage was far freer in Spain itself where Cuban-born Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda achieved fame and fortune. Another handicap faced by those writers who stayed at home was always the lack of sufficient floating population in Havana to sustain a play through long runs, hence the capital's dependence on transient companies of Spanish actors who seldom troubled to learn plays by Cuban authors. As the repertoire of the legitimate stage was almost always foreign, it did not appeal to the ordinary populace as much as the *teatro bufo*, where cheap farces, based on local events and people, were presented.

The revolutionary period from 1868 to 1901 produced very little. José de Armas y Cádenas is remembered for his excellent naturalistic play, *Los triunfadores*, and Raimundo Cabrera was successful with his satirical reviews and musicals. Three names stand out in the modern period. José Antonio Ramos will be remembered for his masterpiece, *La Tembladera*, Gustavo Sánchez Galarraga for his *El Héroe*, and Ramón Sánchez Varona for quite a list of successful plays, among them, *María*, *Con todos y para todos*, and his masterpiece, *La sombra*, first staged in 1938. In conclusion the author states his confidence in the vitality of the Cuban theatre. He believes it will push on to wider horizons despite material handicaps and competition from cheaper forms of entertainment.

The work is accompanied by two bibliographies, one listing 48 titles of critical writings about the Cuban theatre, and the other containing the names and published works of some 442 dramatic authors. An index of persons mentioned in the text concludes the volume.

DONALD F. BROWN

Mac Murray College

Frank Norris, a Study By ERNEST MARCHAND Palo Alto, California · Stanford University Press, 1942 Pp 1x + 258 \$3.00.

Professor Ernest Marchand's *Frank Norris*, a critical study of the novels and some related short stories, is a welcome addition to Norris scholarship. This study of the novelist "against the wider background of his period" is in most respects penetrating and complete, it is not, however, a definitive and final estimate. Norris possibly must remain a contradictory figure since his short life as an author makes final judgments difficult.

This critical study fails to prove that the author of *McTeague* and *The Octopus* is, as Professor Marchand believes, "a major American novelist of the very first significance" (p. 39). It is difficult to reconcile this belief with the author's convictions that Norris never escaped the rather unfortunate control of deterministic philosophy, that he had ceased to grow artistically, and, had he lived, that he would have "continued thenceforth to swing in the same track without much deviation" (p. 190). Here Professor Marchand bends over backward too far in avoiding the easy critical recourse of bemoaning genius cut off by early death. The fact that Norris was able largely to escape the shallow sentimentalism of the Nineties suggests that he had enough literary perception to have realized finally the restrictions imposed upon the novel by determinism. No reason is advanced to justify the assumption that *The Octopus* would have been Norris's sole excursion into social ideas or that later social novels would have followed *The Octopus* pattern exactly. The contradictions in the novelist's work are better explained if we assume that in his early years he was working out his own method and style.

Professor Marchand has wrestled with Norris's confusing use of the terms "romance," "realism," and "naturalism," and shown when and how these literary philosophies entered Norris's fiction. The summaries of the novels are skillfully drawn to bring out the practices from which Norris later drew the theories expressed in his critical articles. After the chapters on Norris as the founder of the short-lived "red-blooded school," on his social ideas, and on his style, the final chapter—"Contemporary Estimates and After-Fame"—is somewhat disappointing. It would have been better to dismiss most of the hack criticism of the contemporary reviewers—leaving a list of such material for the bibliography—and to concentrate more upon the few who wrote with some penetration. A serious omission at this point is the failure to make a study of Norris's influence upon later writers, particularly upon Jack London, called in an earlier chapter "Norris' immediate successor," or upon the social novels of the muck-rakers.

WILLARD E. MARTIN, JR.

Tufts College

The Liberal Mind of John Morley, by WARREN STAEBLER. Princeton University Press for University of Cincinnati 1943 Pp. 221 \$3 50

Early in the last century the newly industrialized north of England was just the right culture for the growth of liberals, of men like the Chartists, Joseph Chamberlain, and Cobden and Bright. Blackburn in Lancashire was evangelical and industrial, offering to eager, aspiring young men not only the reformer's earnestness but also rampant abuses for reforming, and in Blackburn in 1838 was born John Morley, the son of very earnest evangelical parents. As editor of the radical *Fortnightly Review*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and *Macmillan's Magazine* he became one of the distinguished journalists of his age, as Secretary of State for Ireland and Secretary of State for India he rose to prominence as a liberal statesman. As both journalist and statesman he exemplified the typical liberalism of Victorian times.

It is unfortunate that John Morley is so little known today, for the sharpness, the force, and the good sense of his critical writings have lost little of their original appropriateness. A modern generation that can still occasionally quote Felicia Hemans and talk about Herbert Spencer might do well to look into Morley's *Voltaire* or his *Buñke*. But Morley has had his turn with the modern biographers, who have done well by him. Since his death three biographies have been published: *The Early Life and Letters of John Morley* by Francis W. Hirst, which very thoroughly covers the period from 1838 to 1885, *John, Viscount Morley* by J. H. Morgan, which is especially valuable for the later years, and *The Life of John Morley* by Sardar Ali Khan. *The Liberal Mind of John Morley* by Warren Staebler, an interesting and judicious study of the quality of Morley's liberalism, is a worthy supplement to these works. It is at the same time a valuable analysis of the rationalist liberalism of the Victorian Age.

The influences upon Morley were varied: the Positivism, for instance, of Auguste Comte, the cosmopolitanism of Matthew Arnold, the internationalism of Richard Cobden, and, perhaps most important of all, the rationalism and refined utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill, from whom as a very young man Morley learned that true liberalism is rooted in "respect for the dignity and worth of the individual." Morley's was a liberalism, says Mr. Staebler, "which, along with its intellectual clear-sightedness and human sympathy, knew the necessity for discipline; it faced the fact that good habits can be made only through sustained efforts of the will. He showed that the fruit of liberating thought and education is a character equipped to grapple manfully not only with the problems of politics and social science but with the more grievous ones of personal existence as well, he proved that democracy after all need

not be incompatible with aristocracy" In its best sense liberalism was to Morley, in his own words, "the fruit of education and thought, not the spontaneous and half accidental suggestion of contemporary requirements and events" That idea alone is worth propagating in this day of liberalism by testimonial and endorsement.

The chief difficulty that Mr Staebler has had to face in writing his book is John Morley himself, who by living for eighty-five years made almost impossible the task of presenting an entirely consistent definition of his liberal creed. What Morley believed in 1865 about progress, what he believed as a Little Englander about imperialism, and what he believed about both science and religion in the days when his *Fortnightly Review* was the solace of evolutionists and the scandal of bishops—all these beliefs and others too underwent considerable modification as the years went by Mr Staebler has faced this difficulty honestly in his final chapter, in which he has been careful to point out the many changes of an active mind But in Morley the old Millite humanitarianism did persist through it all—and that particular persistence is a convenience and a comfort to anyone attempting to integrate the liberalism of Victorians.

EDWIN M EVERETT

University of Georgia

BRIEF MENTION

Greta Hall. By H. W. HOWE. London Privately Printed. Curwen Press, 1943 Pp vi + 78 4s 6d This informative and modest book, published for the celebration held at Keswick in August, 1943, of the centenary of Southey's death, tells the story of Greta Hall, the home of Coleridge and Southey The rich, literary associations of this house created by its famous residents and its visitors of renown, can be equalled by few houses in England. Mr. H. W. Howe, headmaster of the Keswick School of which Greta Hall is now a part, tells the story through the lives of the Coleridges and Southseys. This section of the book will be largely familiar to students of this period of literary history, yet the collection of material, gleaned from a wide reading in nineteenth-century memoirs and letters, should be convenient even for the specialist. Unfortunately, the absence of documentation often makes the tracing of quotations to their sources a puzzling task. The account of Southey's life, however, is illuminated by facts and illustrations that come from his unpublished letters and are not elsewhere available The sympathetic treatment of Southey and Mrs. Coleridge is a welcome one, offsetting many carping and captious criticisms.

Students will be most interested in the description of the site, construction, and subsequent remodeling of Greta Hall, in the record of its owners from Wilham Jackson to the present day, and in the excellent floor-plan of Greta Hall with the identification of the various rooms—quaintly called Peter, Paul, Hartley's Parlour, the Saints Room, Duck Row—and their several inhabitants.

KENNETH CURRY

University of Tennessee

A Newman Treasury Selections from the Prose Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman Edited by C F HARROLD New York Longmans, 1943 Pp xii + 405 \$3 50. A one-volume collection of Newman's prose is particularly welcome after the loss of the publisher's stock of the complete sets of his works in the London air-raids of 1940-41. Mr Harrold has provided a 32-page introduction to an anthology designed "to present most of what Newman himself would have wished or permitted to be published in one volume at the end of his career" Just how Mr Harrold knows what Newman would have wished to be published, he does not tell; and perhaps it would be futile to argue as, without evidence, one judgment is as good as another. It is debatable, however, whether Mr. Harrold has provided "some intelligent principle" for selection Certainly a more useful principle might have been to select those passages in Newman that are most relevant and beneficial to the modern world There is much in Newman that is wise, liberal, tolerant, and humane—qualities that a world striving after the ideal of the Four Freedoms might well seek to achieve But perhaps three-quarters of the present selections are theology—and being Newman's, dogmatic theology. They contain little of those qualities

Mr. Harrold's introduction is, quite naturally, apologetic rather than critical but, on the whole, is balanced and scholarly. It is, therefore, a little surprising to be told (p. 3) that Butler is a great divine of the seventeenth century and later (p. 5) a citizen of the eighteenth century.

ERNEST C. MOSSNER

Syracuse University

The Seventeenth Century Background. By BASIL WILLEY. London: Chatto and Windus, 1942. Pp. viii + 315. \$3.75. Scholars will welcome this new reprinting of Mr. Willey's Cam-

bridge lectures, which the Columbia University Press is sponsoring in this country. One cannot always agree with the author's views, for one feels that he does not always allow for those multitudinous exceptions that make the clear-cut sketching of an age's profile almost impossible. One also finds it temperamentally difficult to accept Willey's Neo-scholastic point-of-departure and "specular" glass. This is, however, one of the most stimulating books on the seventeenth century that has ever been written, and now that a new issue is printed, it should be part of every scholar's library.

D. C. A.

The Clue to Pascal. By EMILE CAILLIET. Foreword by JOHN A. MACKAY. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943. Pp. 187. \$2.00. The outgrowth of lectures given last summer at Princeton Theological Seminary, this book stresses Pascal's religious life rather than his achievements in science or as a *prosateur* of genius. The *Pensées* is quoted much more frequently than the *Provinciales*. The Bible is the "clue." "Never was a Roman Catholic nearer to evangelical Protestantism, nor farther away. In this supreme antinomy is summed up for us the secret of Pascal, and of his anguish" (p. 166). M. Cailliet has studied Pascal with wide knowledge both of what he wrote and of what has been written about him. He presents his author sympathetically and with fervor. The fact that the material was originally given in the form of lectures does not prevent extensive documentation. To read the book makes one hope that a larger work on Pascal which its author proposes to write will not be long delayed.

H. C. L.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LAST NEW VOLUMES OF RILKE'S LETTERS. A thorough examination of the first three volumes of the new edition of Rilke's letters in the light of the similar volumes of the older edition has already been made by Eudo Mason. (Cf. "The New Volumes of Rilke's Letters," *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Vol. XXXV, No. 4, Oct. 1940, p. 506 ff.) Of the last three volumes of the new edition only one makes any departures from the corresponding volume of the earlier edition and the changes are essentially of the type Mason noted. The volumes of the two editions here in question are.

<i>Old Edition</i>	<i>New Edition</i>
Briefe 1914-1921, publ 1937	Gesammelte Briefe Vol 4 (1914-21) publ 1938
Briefe aus Muzot (1921-26) publ 1935	" " Vol 5 (1921-26) publ 1940
Briefe an seinen Verleger publ 1934	" " Vol 6 (an seinen Verleger) publ 1936

Volumes 4 and 6 of the new edition seem to be merely reprints of the old edition except that a "Verzeichnis der Briefempfänger" covering all six new volumes has been added at the end of vol 6. It should be noted, however, that this "Verzeichnis" is untrustworthy and in one important respect it has not been corrected for the changes in the new Vol 5 but was evidently made on the basis of the old "Briefe aus Muzot," possibly because this old volume was sold as part of the new edition until it was finally re-edited.

The new Vol 5, the "Briefe aus Muzot," profits somewhat by the addition of new material and suffers elsewhere in accuracy and completeness because of the special tastes of the editors or such tastes as they felt urged to acquire. The following letters in Vol 5 are either entirely new or appear in more complete form than in the earlier edition.

- P 9 (no 1) The name 'Reinhart' is here given whereas the old edition only gave the initial 'R' (p 9)
- P 36 (no 7) New letter to Sieber, the editor, written shortly before his marriage to Rilke's daughter, welcoming him to the family, but explaining Rilke's own non participation in family life
- P 55 (no 11) New letter to Gräfin M. on the practical and spiritual difficulties of post-war life for Rilke
- P 95 (no 23) New letter to Dr Heygrodt written after the latter's book on Rilke had appeared (Die Lyrik Rainer Maria Rilkes, Freiburg 1921). Perhaps more succinctly than elsewhere, Rilke here defines the fourfold relationship between the artist, the work of art, the critic or biographer and the public
- P 104 (no 26) Four paragraphs of a personal but unimportant nature, omitted in the earlier edition (p 91, no 24) are included here
- P 114 (no 30) This is the famous letter to the Fürstin von Thurn und Taxis announcing the completion of the Duneser Elegien. The exact wording of the central statement differs in the two editions. To the "Aber nun ist. Ist, / Amen" of the first edition (p 101, no 28) the new edition adds still another "Ist," which is also the form in which the Fürstin herself quotes the letter in her book, "Erinnerungen an Rainer Maria Rilke" (München, 1932) although her version of the punctuation, which was evidently difficult to make out, differs from that of the new edition
- P. 285 (no. 90) Another new letter to Gräfin M.

- P 301 (no 93) and p 320 (no 98) Two new letters to Hermann Pongs of great interest because of Rilke's statements on his youthful development Both were previously printed in "Dichtung und Volkstum" Bd 37, 1936
- P 426 (no 126) The last word on the page, 'rein,' has been corrected from the 'reich' of the old edition (p 387)

The following letters have either been omitted or cut in the new Vol 5

Letter to Karl v d Heydt (p 51, no 10 in the old edition) is entirely left out presumably because over half the letter is concerned somewhat intimately with Ruth Rilke

P. 102 (no 25) Only the initials 'E C' are here given for the name of Eva Cassirer who is mentioned twice in the course of the letter (old edition, p 89, no 23) Mason, (*op cit*, p 509) notes that all letters to Eva Cassirer in the earlier volumes have been omitted

Letter to Frau Tronier-Funder which bore no date in the old edition (p. 173, no 54) is omitted because it was evidently put there by mistake It had also appeared in the old Briefe 1914-21, dated 1919, and remains in its proper place in the reprint of this volume (Vol 4, p 224, no 94)

Letter to Annette Kolb (p 175, no 55 in the old edition) is omitted in the new, not because it was addressed to the authoress, since elsewhere other letters of hers have been kept, but probably because of its heartfelt praise of René Schickele Another letter to Annette Kolb, which was not rejected (p 212, no 66), also mentions Schickele, but only in passing

Letter to Ph R., probably Phia Rilke, the poet's mother, is omitted Even in the old edition (p 221, no 73) this letter is not given in full, yet if one guessed that it were addressed to Rilke's mother, one might make certain assumptions, unpleasant to the editors, about the relations between mother and son.

P. 433 (no 129) One of the last letters Rilke wrote The last paragraph has again been omitted because of an unpleasant though obscure reference to the family (Old edition, p 394, no 127)

HOWARD ROMAN

Harvard University

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

NOVEMBER, 1944

Number 7

ANTIPODES

Il paraît que c'est la destinée des mots savants de recevoir un minimum d'attention de la part des lexicographes d'une génération de philologues pour qui la phonologie est tout et la sémantique rien ou fort peu de chose. Aussi n'est-on pas étonné de noter que l'article *Antipodes* est ou bien tout-à-fait absent ou bien réduit à quelques observations banales dans la plupart des dictionnaires français, à commencer par Littré jusqu'aux ouvrages récents de MM. Tobler, Gamillscheg et v. Wartburg.

Or il est avéré que le mot *Antipodes*, en dehors de son acception érudite bien connue, dérivée du grec, en a reçu, au cours du moyen âge, une deuxième, franchement nouvelle, c'est-à-dire inconnue dans les textes grecs et latins de l'antiquité. C'est celle qui nous occupera dans cette modeste contribution à la lexicographie de l'ancien français.

Dans l'*Erec* de Chrétien de Troyes, composé peu après 1160, on passe en revue les vassaux d'Arthur

Bilis,¹ li rois d'Antipodes
De toz nains fu Bylis li mendres
Par richesce et par signorie
Amena an sa compaignie
Bylis dos rois qui nain estoient
Et de lui lor terre tenoient
A mervoilles l'esgardoit l'an
Quant a la cort furent venu,
Formant i furent chier tenu
A la cort furent come roi
Enoré et servi tuit troi,
Car mult estoient gentil home.²

¹ Variants: bylis, belins, bilius. On Bilis-Pelles cf. R-S Loomis, *PMLA*, LVI (1941), p. 921 et suiv.

² Je me sers du texte de M. Jean Misrahi, reproduit par M. R-S Loomis, *Modern Philology*, XXXVIII (1941), p. 292 et suiv.

On trouve une idée semblable dans le *Normannicus Draco*, poème latin d'Etienne de Rouen, composé vers 1168. Là le roi Arthur, après son décès et son transfert à Avalon, île sacrée est censé vivre parmi les Antipodes.³ Si Chrétien laisse dans l'ombre la localité exacte de ces Antipodes, Etienne de Rouen est beaucoup plus explicite: il dit expressément qu'Arthur règne sur le *hemisphaerium inferius, inferior mundus. Evolat ad superiores, quandoque recurrit ad ima*.⁴ L'antériorité du poème de Chrétien rend impossible l'hypothèse de M. Tatlock d'après laquelle l'auteur clérical du *Draco* aurait puisé indépendamment, sur sa propre responsabilité pour ainsi dire, dans certains auteurs classiques tels que Pomponius Mela, Pline l'Ancien, Solin, le *Somnium Scipionis* de Cicéron ou Martien Capella.⁵ Si influence classique et érudite il y a, il faut qu'elle se montre déjà dans Chrétien, dont l'auteur du *Draco* n'aurait fait que suivre l'exemple. En effet, Ferdinand Lot⁶ crut sérieusement à un emprunt, de la part de Chrétien, au livre des *Etymologies* (xiv, 6) d'Isidore de Séville.

Quoi qu'il en puisse être, la tradition ne prit pas fin avec Etienne de Rouen. Les *Gesta regum Britanniae*, composés vers 1235 et dédiés à Cadioc, évêque de Vannes, condamnent Modred, neveu d'Arthur pour avoir attaqué son oncle, "quem totus metuit mundus, quem totus abhorret Antipodum populus."⁷

Enfin, Gervais de Tilbury, qui composa ses *Otia Imperialia* dans le règne de Jean sans Terre (vers 1211), intitula un de ses contes *De antipodibus et eorum terra*. Le récit en question ne roule nullement, comme on pourrait le croire, sur un voyage en Terre Australe, mais il est tout bonnement un conte folklorique: ces Antipodes sont des nains, comme il a été en effet reconnu par le savant éditeur d'extraits choisis des *Otia*, Félix Liebrecht.⁸

Il serait facile de réduire toute cette tradition à une filiation purement littéraire qui aurait pris origine avec Chrétien, pour se transmettre d'écrivain à écrivain et aboutir à Gervais de Tilbury. Par malheur, une telle hypothèse, par trop simpliste, se heurte à

³ J. S. P. Tatlock, *MP*, xxxi (1933), p. 11.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁶ *Romana*, xlvii (1920), p. 42 et suiv.

⁷ Ed. F. Michel, Londres, 1862, p. 151; voir Loomis, *MP*, xxxviii, 292.

⁸ F. Liebrecht, *Des Gervasius von Tilbury Otia Imperialia in einer Auswahl neu herausgegeben* . . . , Hannover, 1856, p. 118.

deux difficultés 1° Chrétien, certes, était beaucoup moins savant que n'importe lequel de ses successeurs écrivant en latin, 2° cette hypothèse présuppose une connaissance très générale de cette nouvelle acception du mot *Antipodes*, sans quoi ces textes seraient restés incompris. Or, quoi qu'on pense de la popularité des romans de Chrétien, elle n'était certes pas assez grande pour suffire à elle-même à établir cette nouvelle acception du mot dans la conscience de tous les lettrés contemporains. Il n'y a donc qu'une conclusion possible. Chrétien lui-même ne fit que suivre une tradition déjà bien établie qu'il contribua sans doute puissamment à affermir, conclusion tirée il y a déjà quelques ans par M. Loomis⁹. Il s'agit maintenant de savoir comment cette deuxième acception du mot "royaume souterrain des nains ou des fées" s'est d'abord développée.

Inutile d'ajouter ici que l'acception originale du mot *Antipodes* est un produit de la science ionienne qui, de la forme sphérique reconnue à la Terre, conclut que l'hémisphère austral, ou plutôt la partie située au sud de la zone torride (crue inhabitable), était peuplé d'êtres humains en tout semblables aux Méditerranéens. Par suite d'une application fautive de la préposition "sous" (comme cela arrive même de nos jours) on en vint à parler d'un hémisphère "inférieur". De là le passage énigmatique (mais qui est en réalité fort clair) de la lettre du pape Zacharie à St. Boniface à la date du 1^{er} mai 748.

Il y a sous la terre un autre monde, d'autres hommes, ainsi qu'un autre soleil et une autre lune¹⁰.

Par malheur, l'expression *terra inferior* "le monde souterrain" avait encore une autre acception, voire celui de "monde des morts,"

⁹ *MP*, xxxviii, 293.

¹⁰ *Quod alius mundus et alii homines sub terra sint seu sol et luna, MGH, Epistolae*, III, 360, No 80, voir H. van der Linden, *Virgile de Salzbourg et les théories cosmographiques au VIII^e siècle*, dans *Bull. de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques et de la Classe des Beaux-Arts*, 1914, p. 163-87, en l'espèce p. 180 et suiv. Les termes "sous la terre" ici comme chez les auteurs immédiatement antérieurs ou postérieurs à Virgile, signifient sous notre œcumène. L'autre monde veut dire tout simplement l'autre œcumène, les autres hommes sont ceux qui habitent cette autre œcumène. L'autre soleil et l'autre lune veulent dire un autre ciel dans lequel le soleil et la lune occupent d'autres positions amenant ainsi notamment des saisons "opposées" aux nôtres.

désignant le royaume sinistre d'Hadès et Perséphone. C'est donc par une confusion que Macrobe (*Sat* 1, 21, 3) nomme Proserpine "numen terrae inferioris circuli et antipodum"

Dériver la tradition citée ci-dessus d'un seul texte de Macrobe, si populaire qu'on veuille qu'il fût au moyen âge, c'est sans doute tout aussi hasardeux que de la dériver, à l'exemple de Ferdinand Lot, d'un texte des *Etymologies* d'Isidore de Séville. Si influence érudite il y avait,—et cela ne fait pas de doute,—il faut qu'elle repose sur une base considérablement plus large qu'un seul texte. D'autre part, le royaume de Perséphone, dans la pensée des anciens, n'était pas un pays de délices tel que les textes médiévaux le dépeignent et tel qu'il est seul digne du roi Arthur. Voyons donc ce que les anciens racontaient de plus sur la Terre Australe, le pays des Antipodes.

On savait que la Terre Australe était située quelque part au sud et à l'est de l'Inde, et l'on l'identifiait le plus souvent avec l'île de Ceylan, connue alors sous le nom de Taprobane et qu'on croyait beaucoup plus grande qu'elle ne l'est¹¹. D'aucuns y voyaient plus qu'une grande île et la tenaient pour un véritable continent. Pomponius Mela (*De cosmogr*, III, 7) la considère comme une très grande île *aut prima pars Orbis alterius*. Pline l'Ancien (VI, 22), suivi de Solin (c. 53), s'exprime comme suit :

Taprobanem alterum orbem terrarum esse, diu existimatum est, Antichthonum appellatione . . . extra orbem a natura relegata

où il faut noter qu'*Antichthonum* est synonyme d'*Antipodum*.

Or il est certes curieux que Lucain, en résumant la doctrine des Druides, ne s'exprime pas autrement :

Vobis auctoribus, umbrae
Non tacitas Erebi sedes Ditisque profundis
Pallida regna petunt, regit idem spiritus artus
Orbe alio, longae, canitis si cognita, vitae
Mors media est,¹²

où *orbis alius* veut dire, ainsi qu'il a été démontré par Salomon Reinach,¹³ "région, contrée," peut-être "continent."

Il est donc clair que, suivant les Druides, les âmes des défunts s'en allaient vivre dans une autre région ou dans un autre con-

¹¹ Pline, *Histoire naturelle*, VI, 22, Solin, *Collect*, c. 53, Isidore, *Etym*, XIV, 6.

¹² Phars, V, 449-53.

¹³ *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, I (1922), p. 184 et suiv.

continent de la terre séparé par l'océan du monde des vivants. Rien n'indique il est vrai, que cet *orbis alius* des Druides fût la Terre Australe le pays des Antipodes. Il y a pourtant des indices que, quelle qu'en ait été l'opinion des anciens Celtes, les Gallois médiévaux, évidemment sous l'influence des traditions savantes transmises par l'antiquité, identifiaient cet *orbis alius* avec Taprobane, le continent austral. Écoutons ce qu'en disent les triades galloises ¹⁴

Trois piliers de nation de l'île de Prydein le premier est Hu Gadarn (le fort), qui vint le premier, avec la nation des Cymry, dans l'île de Prydein, ils venaient du pays de l'été, qu'on appelle Deffrobani (c'est-à-dire Taprobane), là ou est Constantinople, ils traversèrent la mer Tawch et parvinrent dans l'île de Prydein et en Llydaw, ou ils s'arrêtèrent

Le Hu Gadarn dont il est question dans ce texte est l'ancêtre mythique des Gallois, inventeur de l'agriculture et démiurge. Nous en avons parlé ailleurs ¹⁵. À rapprocher de ce texte la tradition bien connue transmise par César (*BG*, VI, 18) et d'après laquelle les Gaulois se disaient descendus de Dispatyr, divinité nettement chthonienne, on est amené à conclure que le pays mystérieux de Deffrobani-Taprobane est l'équivalent de l'Hadès gréco-romain. Pour l'exprimer autrement, dans la pensée des Gallois médiévaux, la Terre Australe, le pays des Antipodes, était le pays d'outre-tombe d'où les ancêtres des Cymri atteignirent la Grande-Bretagne.

Ce qui confirme cette conclusion, c'est que ce pays d'outre-tombe, loin de ressembler à l'Hadès classique, est décrit, dans ces documents, comme un pays d'abondance, où règne un été éternel (*Gwlad yr Haf* "pays de l'été"), ce qui explique que les céréales étaient censées y avoir pris origine. D'autre part, c'est précisément avec des couleurs tout aussi riantes que les anciens dépeignaient l'île de Taprobane ou le continent austral, supposé abondant en perles et pierres, jouissant d'un climat admirable et dont les habitants atteignaient un âge bien plus grand que les hommes de notre monde. ¹⁶ De fait, la *Vita Merlini*, dans sa description des merveilles de plusieurs îles de l'océan, n'oublie pas Taprobane. D'où il

¹⁴ J. Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, Paris, 1913, II, 295

¹⁵ *ZFSL*, LIX (1935), 361 et suiv.

¹⁶ Plin., *Histoire naturelle*, VI, 22, VII, 2, cp. Martien Capella, ed. Dick, *De nuptus*, VI, p. 346. Cp. aussi la description de l'*orbis alius* donnée par Eihen, *var. hist.*, III, 18, sur l'autorité de Théopompe.

s'ensuit que, sous l'influence d'une tradition savante de l'antiquité, les médiévaux croyaient voir dans la Terre Australe pays des Antipodes, l'*orbis alius*, le pays d'outre-tombe des anciens Celtes¹⁷ Cette identification est complètement indépendante des dires de Macrobie et repose sur certaines croyances eschatologiques assez répandues vers la fin de l'empire romain et d'après lesquelles les Îles des Bienheureux, séjour des morts vertueux, étaient localisées dans la Terre Australe¹⁸ On sait que cette tradition est la source de Dante quand il plaça la montagne du Purgatoire dans cette région de la Terre

Il nous reste un problème à résoudre Dans Chrétien de Troyes, dans le conte précité des *Otia Imperialia*, mais aussi dans un récit du traité *De Nugis Curialium* de Gautier Map cité par M. Loomis,¹⁹ les habitants de ce pays mystérieux sont des nains Dans la pensée de ces auteurs les Antipodes sont donc des nains Comment expliquer cette particularité?

Là aussi il faut supposer deux sources indépendantes, une savante et une populaire Les anciens Grecs connaissaient une tradition d'après laquelle l'intérieur de l'Afrique est habité par des pygmées, peuplade de nains²⁰ Ce qui est moins connu, c'est que les géographes grecs et romains savaient fort bien qu'il y a des nains dans l'Asie du Sud, qu'ils pensaient aux Veddahs de Ceylan, aux habitants des îles Andaman, aux *negritos* de Bornéo, de la Nouvelle-Guinée ou de Mindanao.²¹

D'un autre côté, pour des raisons discutées en détail il y a pres-

¹⁷ Rien n'est plus faux que l'assertion de M. Loomis, *PMLA*, lvi, 896, que les notions eschatologiques changent rapidement et s'oublient vite la conception d'un enfer souterrain, séjour sans joie, n'a pas changé depuis l'époque lointaine qui vit la composition de l'épopée de Gilgamech jusqu'au temps des inscriptions funéraires de la fin de l'Empire romain Les exemples anglo-saxons cités par M. Loomis (p. 896, n. 68) prouvent en effet que les Anglo-Saxons avant leur conversion au christianisme avaient déjà perdu leurs croyances eschatologiques, mais ils ne prouvent pas qu'ils les eussent oubliées On peut ne pas croire à l'Enfer chrétien sans pour cela en ignorer le concept

¹⁸ F. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, New Haven, 1922, p. 80

¹⁹ *PMLA*, lvi, 917

²⁰ Voir Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopaedie*, s. v. *Pygmaei*

²¹ A. De Quatrefages, *The Pygmies*, trans. F. Starr, New-York, 1895, p. 20 et suiv., E. Tyson, *A Philological Essay concerning the Pygmies of the Ancients* (1699), re-edited by B. C. A. Windle, Londres, 1894, p. xvi et suiv.

que quinze ans.²² les nains celtiques et germaniques sont sans exceptions des êtres chthoniens, les ancêtres divinisés (*manes*). Dans les mots d'un savant qui, pour n'être pas philologue, en était sans doute d'autant plus impartial et objectif, le regretté Fridtjof Nansen,²³ les *huldras* norvégiens, les *sið* irlandais et les elfes germaniques étaient à l'origine les morts.²⁴ Il aurait pu ajouter qu'il en est de même chez les *Amazulus*, en sorte qu'il s'agit, suivant toutes les apparences d'une croyance aussi vieille que le monde ou plutôt aussi vieille que l'humanité. Les Celtes n'en faisaient pas exception.

Résumons. Le mot *Antipodes*, en dehors de son acception savante dûment notée par les dictionnaires, au moyen âge en avait reçu une autre : il designait les ancêtres divinisés censés habiter, sous forme de nains, non pas la Terre Australe, mais les enfers (*infern*), pays d'outre-tombe localisé sous terre, le plus souvent à l'intérieur des collines des fées (*sidhe*). Ce développement curieux est dû d'une part à une fausse application de la préposition "sous," de l'autre au fait que le royaume des morts, dans la pensée des anciens Celtes, était situé soit dans un autre continent (*orbis alius*), identifié avec la Terre Australe des anciens géographes soit sous terre, à l'intérieur des collines des fées.

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

Princeton, N. J.

²² Dans mon livre, *The Science of Folk Lore*, Londres, 1330, p. 87 et suiv.

²³ *In Northern Mists*, New York, 1911, II, 60.

²⁴ Chose curieuse, M. Loomis lui-même, et sans s'en apercevoir, cite deux exemples qui ne laissent pas subsister le moindre doute sur la vraie nature de l'"autre monde" celtique. A la p. 917, en resumant le conte de Gautier Map, il fait observer que les nains disparaissent au chant du coq. Mais, comme l'a fait remarquer sir James G. Frazer, dans une de ses pages les plus émouvantes (*Anthropological Essays presented to Edward Burnett Tylor*, Oxford, 1907, p. 137), c'est là le propre des revenants. A la p. 925 et suiv. M. Loomis parle de la sentinelle silencieuse mentionnée par Nennius et des habitants "silencieux" de l'île mystérieuse qui est l'"autre monde" celtique, relevés dans le *Perlesvaus*, dans l'*Imram Brain* et dans l'*Historia Meriadoci*. Mais il ne se rappelle pas que les "silencieux" (*taciti*) sont les morts et que c'est là probablement leur épithète la plus caractéristique. Voir là dessus *Classical Philology*, XXXVI (1941), p. 137, Konrad Schwenck, *Die Sinnbilder der alten Völker*, Frankfurt a. M., 1851, p. 153 et suiv., Camille Sourdille, *Hérodote et la religion de l'Égypte*, Paris, 1910, p. 362, A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, Leipzig, 1930, p. 668.

AN ANONYMOUS SIXTEENTH CENTURY FRENCH
PLAY ON THE DEATH OF LUCRETIA

The overthrow of the Tarquins' dictatorship and the establishment of the republic are represented by Livy, Ovid and other ancient writers¹ as results of the rape by the younger Tarquin, Sextus, of Lucretia, the wife of his cousin and fellow-officer, Collatinus. After being forced, Lucretia made her husband and family swear to avenge her, and then stabbed herself. The effort to do honor to these oaths of vengeance brought about the downfall of the Tarquins.

In spite of its difficulty, this story has tempted many dramatists and other writers in various countries. Hans Galinsky, who has treated the subject extensively in *Der Lucretia-Stoff in der Welt-literatur*,² lists most of these versions, among them four (possibly seven) French plays.³

The earliest in date of the French plays, N. Filleul's *Lucrece*, 1566, he mentions quite rightly only in passing,⁴ for though well known and available in a reprint,⁵ it is a sad performance. Another much superior sixteenth century play, *Tragédie sur la mort de Lucresse*, has entirely escaped Galinsky's notice and indeed that of almost everyone else. This oversight or deliberate omission is possibly due to the fact that the tragedy was left in manuscript by the unknown author. The undated manuscript,⁶ bound in beautiful red leather, is written in a hand extremely difficult to decipher, similar or identical, it appears to me, to that of the manuscript of the *Tragédie de Rhodes*⁷ composed in 1608 by Louis Léger. I do

¹ Livy, I, 55-59, Ovid, *Fasti*, II, lines 721-852. According to La Croix du Maine, Fr. le Duchat published a verse translation of Ovid's version with his *Agamemnon*, Paris, Jean le Preux, 1561. For other possible sources see Dio Cassius, II, Dion Hal., III, 47-63, IV, 64, Valerius Max., VI, 1, 1, L. Florus, I, 8, Zonaras, VIII, 11.

² In *Sprache und Kultur der Germanischen-Romanischen Völker*. B. *Germanistische Reihe*. Band III. Breslau, 1932.

³ Filleul, 1566; Chevreau, 1637, P. du Ryer, 1638, F. Ponsard, 1843. He refers also to possible plays by Louis Napoleon and Arnault (p. 180) and a plan for a "*tragédie en prose*" by Rousseau (p. 174).

⁴ P. 80.

⁵ By Eugène de Robillard de Beurepaire, Rouen, Henri Boissel, 1873.

⁶ No. 25508 at B.N.

⁷ No. 2383 at B.N.

not wish to imply that Léger was the author of the tragedy in question, for there is no close similarity in style, but that the copies were penned by the same or contemporary copyists. Because of this and general stylistic indications, I should say that this tragedy belongs to the reign of Henry IV. Aside from the fact that there is no chorus and that the language is more sober, the manner of composition resembles that of Garnier, Billard, Chrestien des Croix, and others of the time.

The plot, which follows the general indications of the sources with only minor changes, is organized as follows:

I, 1. Sexte tells of his meeting with Lucesse and the torments of his love. 2. Tarquin le Superbe boasts in the customary style of kings in sixteenth century French tragedy.

II, 1. Sexte solves his moral problem by resolving to commit suicide. 2. His *confidant*, Publye, suggests the rape and Sexte accepts the solution.

III, 1. Lucesse relates a dream which warns of the coming tragedy, and discusses it with her nurse. 2. Sexte and Publye set out for Collatie to put their dastardly plan into action. 3. Lucesse welcomes them to her home. Sexte's reason for his visit, "*Quand nous serons seulle, ie vous conteray tout*," is a nice example of *double entendre*.

IV, 1. Collatin and Brute are starting for Collatie in answer to an urgent summons from Lucesse. 2. In a frenzy of rage and grief, Lucesse relates Tarquin's crime to her nurse. 3. Tarquin rejoices in his victory but fears retribution.

V, 1. Lucesse tells her father, Collatin, and Brute the details of Tarquin's attack. Since the relation is rather lively and vivid, a considerable portion of it is quoted here as a sample of the text. Lucesse had fallen asleep after showing her guest to his room,

Et alors qu'un chacun aultre chose ne pense
 Qu'a reposer son corps assoupy en silence
 Luy qui est agité d'infernalle fureur
 (Quand ie pense a cela ie frissonne d'horreur)
 Ayant le glaive au poing entre^s dedans ma chambre
 Et en un mesme temps sur mon liet il se cambre
 Et puis en m'esueillant ce bourreau inhumain
 Me presse l'estomac de sa damnable main
 Ie m'esueille en sursaut de frayeur toute esmeue
 Lors ce meschant me dict, Lucesse ie te tue
 Si tu dis un seul mot et ce poignard d'acier
 Te fera repentir si tu penses crier
 Chetifue que ie suis sentant contre ma gorge
 La pointe du poignard qui ia presque m'esgorge

^s The MS gives *entre*

Si proche me voyant de la fin de mes iours
 Et de moy esloigne tout espoir de secours
 Je n'eusse oze crier Loïs d'une voix flatteuse
 Il commence a conter sa douleur amoureuse
 Il me prie instamment et pour l'obtenir mieux
 Me coniuere a l'aymer par tous les puissants dieux
 De vouloir soulager et appaiser la flamme
 Qui pour l'amour de moy tout le cœur luy enflamme,
 Que si l'eusse voulu ses prieres ouyr
 Et luy permettre aussi de ses Amours ⁹ iouir
 Il me debuoyt donner mille belles richesses,
 Mais ayant aperceu que toutes ses promesses
 Ses parolles, ses vœux, ses coniuations
 Ne pouuoient m'esmouuoir et que ses pations
 le nauoys point a gré lors plus enflé d'audace
 De me faire mourir furieux me menace,
 Et voyant a la fin que malgré ses efforts
 I'arrestoyz d'endurer plustost dix mille morts,
 Puis que dit-il alors vous estes si cruelle,
 Puis qu'a ma volonte vous estes si rebelle,
 Vous mouriez de ma main et de ce mien estoc
 L'ouuriray vostre cœur plus dur que n'est vn roc
 Et affin que la mort vous donne plus de peine
 Pour auoir enuers moy esté si inhumaine
 Mon valet icy pres aussi l'esgorgeray
 Et dans vn mesme lit tous deux vous coucheray
 Je publieray partout, par les dieux ie le iure,
 Que pour vous chastier et pour vanger l'iniure
 Qu'ensemble vous faisiez à vostre Collatin
 J'auray d'un mesme coup à vos iours mis la fin
 Je vouloyz bien mourir mais la crainte de honte
 Qui onc ne me quitta mon courage surmonte
 Et lors Sexte du corps non de l'ame vainqueur
 La despouille emporta de mon pudique honneur

She then stabs herself, and Brute, withdrawing the knife, swears to avenge the crime. The others swear to do likewise.

2 Tarquin le Superbe and his son Arons are told by a messenger that Brute has aroused the populace to rebellion by a speech over Lucretia's dead body. Tarquin reproaches the absent Sexte and breaks into lamentations, accusing the Romans of ingratitude.

It seems fairly certain that the author consulted both Livy and Ovid. For example Sexte's reference in the first act to Lucretia's

⁹ This word is almost illegible in the MS. *Amours* is probably the correct reading.

blonds cheveux must have been suggested by Ovid.¹⁰ since the color of her hair is not mentioned in the other source- but at least one detail in Lucretse's confession

Pour le moins cy apres mon exemple publique
Aulcune n'apprendra a viure en impudique

occurs only in *Livy*.¹¹

The author imitated also certain patterns of style, originally from classical models but present in nearly all sixteenth century tragedies- laments with apostrophes to the sky, sea, gods or other things- dreams and discussions of their value- long comparisons. the *impossible* motif, arguments concerning suicide, boasts by kings and leaders of power and prowess

In addition to these common traits, the author has used a procedure similar to that of Jean de la Taille's grating of *Heircules Furens* on the biblical story of Saul. Instead of *Heircules* he has apparently used Garnier's *Hippolyte* and has even pointed out the analogy himself. In Act iv, Lucretse, feeling that her involuntary loss of chastity will be judged a crime, refers to similar cases of innocence unjustly punished. Among others, she compares herself to Hippolyte

Ainsy dedans l'enfer Phœdie te precipite
Pour se voir refusée o trop chaste Hypollite

As a first result of this imitation, *Sexte* is a strange mixture of the characters of *Phedre* and *Hippolyte*. Like the latter, he had been fond of hunting and related pleasures

Et contre ma coustume et mon humeur chagrine
Ie ne desire plus ainsy que ie souloys
Courir vn sanglier pour le rendre aux aboys
La chasse me deplaist et la course et la lucte,
Lancer le sauelot ou ma dextre est bien duiete
Me sont a contre cœur ¹²

At the same time *Sexte*, like *Phedre*, considers his love incestuous a disease.

¹⁰ *Fasti*, II, 763 Forma placet niveusque color flavique capilli

¹¹ I, 58 nec ulla deinde impudice Lucretia exemplo vivet

¹² I, 1 Garnier, *Hippolyte*, III, 2, describes (from Seneca) Hippolyte's shyness and fondness for hunting. The analogy with Racine's *Phedre*, II, 2, lines 548-552, is even closer, though there can be no question of influence

Le mal me presse fort et qui plus me desplaist
 C'est qu'estant au mourir encor mon mal me plaist
 C'est vn mortel poison qui lentement rebouche
 La vigueur de l'esprit aussitost qu'il le touche
 Plus ie veux cest amour chasser par la raison
 Plus ie me sens serre dans sa forte prison
 O vous tous aultres dieux
 Desracinez le mal qui mon ame tourmente ¹³

Like Phèdre also, he resolves to end his torments by suicide, and argues the matter with Publye (in the rôle of the nurse), who suggests the crime

Lucesse too has some of the elements of the same two characters. Like Hippolyte, she suffers the consequences of a crime of which she is innocent, while the protests of her nurse against her resolve to die have many analogies with those of Phèdre's

Lucesse's nurse

Ce n'est pas vn pesche quand par la violence
 On force nostre corps a faire quelque offence

Phèdre's nurse

On peut forcer le corps, mais l'âme qui est pure,
 Malgré le ravisseur est exempte d'injure ¹⁴

A dream in which Lucesse was the object of an attack by a *bouc* that had at first fawned upon and then trampled her may have been suggested by Hippolyte's vision of an attack by a lion ¹⁵

There is also the further analogy of the unsatisfactory auspices and disturbed sacrifices following both dreams

By her fierce pride and inflexible will, Lucesse is also a worthy forerunner of Corneille's heroines. When her nurse tried to convince her of her entire innocence, she haughtily replied

Ces raisons pourroyent bien vn cœur lasche fleschir,
 Mais le mien de l'honneur ne sceut iamaiz gauchir

This tragedy has evident faults, most of them common to the

The fact that *sangler* is treated as a word of three syllables makes it probable that the play is not earlier than the reign of Henri IV

¹³ The general tone and idea are those of Phèdre's confession to her nurse, *Hippolyte*, II, 1, though there is little verbal similarity

¹⁴ *Hippolyte*, V, last two lines before *choeur*

¹⁵ *Hippolyte*, I, 2

others of the period it is verbose and awkward, all in long monologues, and the verse is often lame and the rimes weak, the idea of tragedy that of the sixteenth century but the author does bring in the crude beginning of psychological analysis. The characters try to explain and justify their conduct.

More interesting still, we find the rudiments of a dramatic struggle. As Sexte (Act I) discusses his love, he finally realizes that what he contemplates is not exactly honorable.

Mais quoy, voudray ie bien de mon cher Collatin
Raur la chaste espouse? O malheur! O destin!
O fortune! O incombres! O ciel! O Amphitrite!
O fleuves infernaux, Flegeton et Cocyte!
Recevez-moy plustost. Je ne le feray pas
Plustost, Grand Jupiter, iette en bas ta tempeste,
Que ton foudre grondant vienne escraser ma teste
Que ie face cela.

After several pages of this, he leaves for battle, hoping to forget his illicit love.

In the second act, he is beginning to lose the struggle, and his sufferings, like those of Phèdre, approach madness.

Mais Sexte, où est ton cœur que l'amour monstrueux
En ton ame naissant t'a rendu furieux?

Meurs donc asseurement auant que ceste rage
Contre ta parenté¹⁶ commette cest oultrage.

Although this resolve to sacrifice his life to his honor appears sincere, the author represents him as too easily persuaded by Publye to undertake the crime.¹⁷

L'auis n'est pas mauuais, c'est le chemin plus court
Pour estre iouissant du fruit de mon amour.

In spite of this ready surrender, Sexte's character has, nevertheless, been so rehabilitated that he can almost conform to the ideal of the tragic protagonist, essentially good but having faults and weaknesses that lead to his downfall. The cold-blooded criminal of the legend and Filleul's *Lucrece* has become an over-indulged,

¹⁶ The accent does not show in the text, but *parente* would produce an example of *coupe féminine*.

¹⁷ None of the sources indicate that anyone suggested the crime to Sexte. This seems another example of the *Hippolyte* pattern imposed upon the story.

weak young man still possessing the vestiges of a sense of decency and honor but ready to snatch at any means of obtaining what he wants.

The language is less dated than Garnier's or even Montchrétien's, it has none of the diminutives, compounds and coinages of the Pléiade, and is much simpler and in better taste than that of such contemporaries as Billard, Nicolas de Montreux, or Chrétien des Croix

It seems to me, moreover, that this tragedy, crude as it may appear to modern taste, represents an advance over those of Jodelle, Filleul, and Garnier, but that the progress should be so small for so great a lapse of time demonstrates the slowness with which tragedy was inching forward to prepare the way for the seventeenth century

LANCASTER E. DABNEY

The University of Texas

COMME QUOI

Les grammaires de Plattner (II, 2, IV, 73), de Sandfeld (II, 71) et de Le Bidois (II, 634) nous renseignent sur l'emploi moderne de cette conjonction qui est caractéristique du style familier. Il y a en somme deux emplois, l'un dans l'incidente dépendant de verbes comme *raconter, expliquer, dire* (ou leurs équivalents, p. ex. *faire l'observation*), plus rarement *voir (découvrir)* et *vouloir*, et où la conjonction a à peu près la valeur de *que*,—et l'autre dans la principale, que Plattner est seul à enregistrer "Comme quoi tout s'efface avec le temps, comme quoi tout s'effrite" et que je trouve p. ex. dans le numéro du 18 août 1934 de "Pour la victoire" la moralité d'une histoire sur les gendarmes français qui, alors déjà, commençaient à avoir peur du jour des comptes qui suivrait de près la victoire interalliée, est formulée ainsi: *Comme quoi, la "peur du gendarme" est le commencement de la sagesse*" (à remarquer la virgule après *comme quoi*).

L'explication de cette conjonction ne me semble pas encore fermement établie: Sandfeld voit en *comme quoi* "une vieille combinaison de *comme* (= comment) avec la forme 'forte' de la conjonction *que*" et compare la forme vulgaire de la conjonction *com-*

ment que (ils se douteront comment que je les ai eues). C'est en somme l'explication de Tobler, *Verm Beitr* I, 165, qui offre comme parallèles a fi *de quoi par coi por coi* à côté de *dont, par que, por que*. Mais comment que (et quand que, pourquoi que etc.) s'expliquent évidemment par le schéma que le français moderne tend à généraliser d'après *parce que, lorsque, quoique, combien que* etc. adverbe + *que*, et ne peut rien prouver pour un *comme quoi* = *comme que*. D'autre part, un *de quoi* (encore chez Corneille, *Galerie du Palais je ne m'étonne plus de quoi je gagne tant*) me semble mieux s'expliquer par le pronom relatif tonique "je ne m'étonne plus de la raison pourquoi (= *de quoi*) je gagne tant," cf aussi Lerch, *Hist Synt.* II, 108 (qui voit dans *de quoi* un successeur moyen fr de l'anc. fr *dont* d'origine parallèle *dont* = *de unde* avec *unde* pronom interrogatif *je m'étonne dont, de quoi* = "je m'étonne (et voudrais savoir) de quoi [vient que]," cf angl. *I wonder how* "je m'étonne [et j'aimerais bien savoir] comment")

Tobler pense que l'explication de Littré, s. v. *comme* n° 4 "wird schwerlich jemand befriedigen" Voici ce que dit l'illustre lexicographe "*Comme quoi*, de quelle façon Voilà comme quoi il est fort dangereux d'avoir demi-étudié Balz . . Vous savez comme quoi je vous suis tout acquise, Corn, Rod. . . *Comme quoi* est aussi interrogatif, mais très peu usité en cet emploi. Comme quoi n'êtes-vous pas persuadé? // *Comme quoi* est de difficile explication. *Comme* a parfois le sens de comment, et l'on dit, interrogativement, ayant mal entendu. *comme quoi* ? Cette étoffe est comme du satin, si on a mal entendu, on dira dans le langage très familier *Comme quoi* ? *Comme quoi* est devenu de la sorte une locution faite, qui s'est introduite pour ne signifier rien de plus que comment." Donc, Littré pense à un *comme quoi* ? (faisant écho à des phrases du type . . *comme du satin*) = "comment ?," ayant débordé les limites originaires. On trouve un *comme quoi* ? aussi dans l'acceptation "comme [par exemple] quoi ?," "dans quel genre ?," p. ex (probablement) dans un passage tiré de O. Feuillet, cité par Plattner sans référence plus précise "Je vous demanderai un jour une foule de chose qui m'inquiètent, que je ne sais pas et que je voudrais savoir !—*Comme quoi* ? [= des choses de quel genre ?]—*Comme quoi* ? c'est-ce que vous ne saurez pas de si tôt." ¹

¹ Je crois ce *comme quoi* ? = "comme [par exemple] quoi ?" identique à

Haase, *Franz Syntax des 17 Jhs* (1888), p 63 est seul à avoir vu qu'on doit partir d'une interrogation directe parallèle à *comme cela* (*comme ça*) ² *ce livre est comme ça* = 'ainsi' ~ *comme qu'on est le livre* = 'comment', p ex Guez de Balzac "*Comme qu'on* jour tranquillement du présent, qui n'est pas bon" (= 'comment jour. '), de là dans l'interrogation indirecte (*id*) "je ne vois pas *comme qu'on* [= 'comment'] on peut faire obéir les autres," La Fontaine "et voici *comme qu'on*" (= 'comment'). *Comme qu'on*² et *comme q(él)a* doivent être tous deux des expressions populaires substituant à la précision du terme synthétique ('comment' = 'ainsi') l'à-peu-près d'une comparaison plutôt vague et un tour analytique qui est en harmonie avec le développement général du français moderne (cf le 'décumul' dans *ensuite* > *après ça*, H. Frei, *La grammaire des fautes*, p 203) et, d'ailleurs, aussi en anglais (*like this* au lieu de *thus*, *what like?* au lieu de *how?*) Sur la priorité de *comme qu'on*² dans l'interrogation directe nous trouvons une information précieuse dans une des *Remarques sur la langue française* de Vaugelas (1647), p 333 de l'édition de la Société des textes français modernes "*comme quoy* est un terme nouveau, qui n'a cours que depuis peu d'années, mais qui est tellement usité, qu'on l'a à tous propos dans la bouche. Après cela, on ne peut pas blâmer ceux qui l'ont écrit, même à l'exemple d'un des plus excellents & des plus célèbres Écrivains de France, qui s'en sert d'ordinaire pour *comment, comme quoy*, dit-il, n'êtes-vous point persuadé, pour dire, *comment n'êtes-vous persuadé*. Mais pour moi, j'aimerois mieux dire, comment, selon cette règle générale, *qu'un mot ancien, qui est encore dans la vigueur de l'Usage, est incomparablement meilleur à écrire, qu'un tout nouveau, qui signifie la même chose* . .

L'emploi signalé par Godefroy dans son lexique de la langue de Corneille 'Il a vu . . 'Qui?' - 'Daphnis, et n'en a remporté / Que ce qu'elle devoit à sa témérité' - '*Comme qu'on*' - 'Des mépris, des rigueurs sans pareilles' (*La Suivante*)

² Il est vrai que l'histoire de *comme cela* n'est pas encore établie. Existait-il déjà au XVII^e siècle? Dans le conte de *Cendrillon* de Perrault (1677) la fille aînée dit *un vilain Cendrillon comme cela*, mais *comme cela* a le sens littéral comparatif, avec un *cela* neutre appliqué 'au' Cendrillon (Cendrillon) désérialisé; il ne s'y agit nullement d'un emploi grammaticalisé (= 'ainsi'). Toujours est-il que la nuance familière et vague est encore très forte (*il parla ainsi—il disait comme ça* . .).

Ce n'est pas que je ne me voulusse servir de *comme quoy*, qui a souvent bonne grace, mais ce ne seroit gueres que dans un stile familier" Cette remarque, négligée par Tobler et Sandfeld, nous indique que *comme quoi*² interrogatif était du temps de Vaugelas un néologisme récent, au moins dans la langue de Paris Il sera donc de bonne méthode de partir de l'emploi le plus anciennement attesté et d'expliquer celui-ci, non pas par de l'ancien français, mais par du français contemporain du grammairien.³ Il est évident que l'interrogatif direct *comme quoi n'êtes-vous point persuadé*², correspondant à un all *wie so sind Sie nicht uberzeugt*² = "wie [ist es] so dass Sie nicht uberzeugt sind", à un all ancien *wie dass* = "wie [kommt es] dass" et à un anglais *how (does it) come (that) you are not convinced*² doit s'expliquer par un tour elliptique "*comme quoi* (= à quoi do.s-je comparer le fait que) vous n'êtes point persuadé", "comment est-il possible que . . ."—la 'grâce' et le ton familier viennent de la nuance d'embarras et d'étonnement qui se traduit d'une façon spontanée par la question *Comment . . .*² est l'expression de gens sensés qui savent dominer leur étonnement, *comme quoi*² nous permet de réaliser les sentiments de l'individu parlant, impuissant de s'orienter (tant la chose rapportée est inouïe), mais tâchant de trouver un cas parallèle comparable. Littré était au moins bien inspiré en partant de la question directe, bien que l'exemple particulier choisi par lui *comme du satin*—*Comme quoi*² ne puisse pas nous servir de modèle, il a vu plus juste que Tobler, qui construisait un *quoi* forme tonique de la conjonction *que*, pratiquement inexistant, et Haase a vu plus juste que les deux grammairiens ensemble

Le *comme quoi*² de l'interrogation directe, devenu égal à un *comment*² familier, mais retenant son ton d'étonnement, passe ensuite à l'interrogation indirecte la phrase de Corneille *vous savez comme quoi je vous suis tout acquise* (*Rodogune*) veut donc dire "vous savez comme [c'est sans parallèle que] je vous suis tout acquise," c'est à dire que *comme quoi* insiste sur les circonstances de détail inouïes, sans parallèle, dans lesquelles le fait "je vous suis tout acquise" se vérifie Dans un autre passage de Corneille:

² Le dictionnaire de la langue du XVI^e siècle d'Huguet n'a aucun exemple de *comme quoi*, ce qui confirme les dires de Vaugelas Au contraire, Marguerite Buffet répète encore en 1688 que *comme quoi* est une expression nouvelle

"Jugez après cela *comme quoi* je vous aime" (*Illusion comique*)* on pourrait admettre l'équivalence de l'incidente à "[Jugez de] l'amour sans parallèle [*comme quoi*?] que je sens pour vous" On notera que les verbes *savoir*, *juger*, *voir* (dans *voilà*) indiquent la possibilité qu'a l'interlocuteur de vérifier *comment* ("wie, wie in aller Welt") la chose étonnante dont on parle a pu arriver Cet emploi subsiste encore dans des phrases comme "Elle découvrait dans l'espace *comme quoi* c'était impossible qu'on m'ammenât" (Boylesve), "Dieu voulut qu'il y vît *comme quoi* le sultan Envo- yait tous les jours une sultane en terre" (Musset), où *comme quoi* n'est sûrement pas, comme dit la grammaire de Le Bidois, "un simple outil de subordination" "L'emploi de *comme quoi* au sens de *comment* marquant la manière semble assez rare," dit Sandteld il n'a qu'un exemple 'contemporain' tiré de Zola "Madame Alexandre prit place au comptoir, servit la clientèle car madame Edouard n'avait jamais eu d'autre souci que d'être avec la majorité de ses acheteurs *Voilà comme quoi* la présence de madame Alexandre, au comptoir , devint pour tous un signe certain que l'école des Frères devait bien être malade." Pourtant cet emploi est celui qui, dans l'incidente, se rapproche le plus du sens originaire ("voilà comment il a pu se faire que ,," avec la nuance de l'étonnement) L'emploi courant aujourd'hui, après les *verba dicendi* ("Elle *racontait* ses petites affaires, *comme quoi*, par exemple, elle allait hériter de 17 ou 18 millions", "Alors, pour m'excuser, je tâchais de lui *expliquer comme quoi* ce n'était pas notre faute aussi"), contient un *comme quoi* = *comment*, légèrement ironique, qui distancie l'individu parlant des paroles qu'il rapporte (dans le dernier exemple de ses propres paroles, qui lui sont devenues étrangères) c'est comme si la nuance primordiale d'étonnement, d'embarras s'était émoussée et comme s'il ne restait que ce sentiment de la distance, ce dédoublement de l'individu parlant en rapporteur et en critique de paroles qu'il n'est pas tenu d'approuver: *Elle racontait ses petites affaires, comme quoi . . .*

* M. Lancaster me signale le fait que Corneille n'a introduit *comme quoi* que dans l'édition de 1660. de 1639 à 1657 le texte portait le *se discret*. C'est dire que l'expression avait en 1660 encore toute sa fraîcheur

* J'omets la virgule que j'ai trouvée dans le texte peut-être y a-t-il là une interprétation secondaire de *comme quoi* = 'de tout ceci résulte,' 'à la suite de quoi on peut dire' (avec *quoi* interprété comme relatif), qu'il ne faut pas prendre trop au sérieux du point de vue historique.

elle allait hériter = ' elle racontait qu'elle allait hériter, mais c'étaient ses (étonnantes) petites affaires à elles qui ne me regardent pas dont je n'ai pas à m'occuper " Le nivellement de *comme quoi* 'comment' > 'que' a un parallèle en *comment* au lieu de *que* complétif (' Je ne comprends pas *comment* tu épouses une femme qui a deux enfants ' " il me raconte comment on avait mis le feu, dans la nuit, à la maison . " Sandfeld, p 71) : à l'origine *comment* donnait une image de la manière dont s'accomplit un événement puis le *fait*, qui est arrivé, dominera dans l'esprit de l'individu parlant Je vois la même distance un peu railleuse dans le *comme quoi* de la phrase principale qui doit être une extraction secondaire de l'emploi en incidente ' Comme quoi ' la ' peur du gendarme ' est le commencement de la sagesse " — le ton interrogatif manque, donc il faut comprendre une dérivation du *comme quoi* = *que* et suppléer un sujet de type général "[on dirait] comme quoi . . ." " comme disait l'autre . " Le sage qui formule la maxime reste anonyme c'est peut-être le peuple lui-même qui, d'une façon ironique (en se distanciant de lui-même), constate *comme quoi* La syntaxe est la même que dans des titres de chapitre '[ici on nous dit] Comment la peur . . est le commencement . ' Nous avons ici une analogie frappante du *que* du style 'gendarme' en français (*que* en commencement de phrase = '[on rapporte] que') et du *que* 'narratif' espagnol (*que muerto se quedó en la calle* = 'disent que'), dont j'ai traité dans *Revista de filología hisp.* IV, 105 Au lieu de donner la maxime seule, on introduit un individu parlant fictif, sorte de spectateur ironique qui voit la situation de haut et de loin, et dont l'opinion sera, de ce chef, plus balancée et plus juste Bien entendu, cette conclusion ironique n'est à sa place que dans la parlure familière. on n'imagine pas un *comme quoi* dans le résumé d'un traité de physique !

Si mon explication est juste, nous trouvons ici un cas remar-

* Sur l'histoire de la déchéance de *comme quoi* cf Brunot, *Hist d l langue fr* VI, 2, p 1438 " *Comme quoi* a été condamnée par l'Académie en 1704 Voltaire le chasse de la tragédie Féraud [fin du XVIII^e siècle] . l'accepte dans le style familier (Mariv, Gresset), et même le préfère à *comment* dans le style badin ou critique (Linguet). Reléguée aussi par A^e [la 5^e ed du dict de l'Académie, 1798] dans le st [yle] f.[amilier] l'interrogation directe *Comme quoi avez-vous fait cela?* ainsi que disent encore " quelques-uns "

quable de la survivance d'une nuance psychologique antérieure à la grammaticalisation du tour d'expressions *comme quor*? était né dans la question étonnée et c'est cet étonnement qui subsiste encore dans la parlure familière et "distanciée" d'aujourd'hui, dans laquelle *comme quor* est devenu, au point de vue grammatical, équivalent à un 'que' (*elle racontait comme quor, comme quor "la peur du gendarme"* ¹) La nuance sémantique de la tournure contemporaine s'explique par son historique la vue diachronique et la vue synchronique se complètent l'une l'autre, comme dans tant de problèmes de linguistique

LEO SPITZER

A PHASE OF PEREDA'S WRITINGS IN IMITATION OF BALZAC

Pereda was a staunch nationalist, when not more specifically a regionalist, and was fond of ridiculing his countrymen's imitation of French styles, both as to social manners and literary practices. Yet Pereda himself was not free of French influence in his writing. In the main, the influence is remote and can be seen only in general characteristics common to writers of the realistic period. There is one particular kind of writing, however, in which imitation of the French is clear and specific. This is the analytical essay or treatise, satirical in nature, for which Balzac's *physiologies* of marriage serve as Pereda's models. Interest centers primarily on the similarity of technique in the two writers, since they have little in common as regards ideas, attitudes, and objectives.

The pseudo-scientific treatise was one of two essentially different kinds of *physiologies* which flourished in France in the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century. The other was the analysis of a social type, not as an individual, but as an abstract representative embodying traits common to an entire group.¹

¹ Both forms reflect the nineteenth-century interest in science; the first by its methodical, "scholarly" procedure, and the second by its imitation of biological investigation, that is, by its study of a social type much as a biologist would examine a species in the animal kingdom. The writing of *physiologies* became a veritable literary fad in France around 1840. In many cases the genre was merely a sportive exercise of little literary consequence. Many writers, however, especially of the analyses of types,

Balzac and Pereda wrote *physiologies* of the second kind, but the resemblance of the two writers to each other is not so specific as it is in the case of the treatise. Most likely, in his delineation of abstract types² Pereda was following the French through a form of Spanish *costumbrismo* patterned after sketches such as those contained in *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes*³ I confine my discussion, therefore, to the analytical essay as handled by Balzac and Pereda.

Balzac gives us an elaborate demonstration of the treatise technique in his *Physiologie du mariage* (1824-29). With professorial bearing he examines various aspects of his subject, taking into consideration causes and remedies for sundry flaws in marital relations, and presents his material in a systematic, factual manner as though he were making a scientific study. Like a student in research, he brings an accumulation of data to bear on his thesis, supplies statistics, and cites studies on related subjects. He resorts to a numerical listing of items to be proved, employs a question and answer method of investigation, and punctuates his dissertation with numerous axiomatic statements. With all its semblance of a scientific treatise, however, the book remains a literary essay written in a derisive mood by one who is posing as a philosopher of society. *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale*⁴ is also a *physiologie* of the dissertation kind. This work includes at the same time the technique employed in the analysis of types, especially through the presentation of exemplary episodes and the use of scenic and dialogue material to demonstrate the theory expressed by the title.

seriously undertook to leave a record of contemporary society. *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes*, 8 vols., Paris, 1840-42, is a good illustration of this objective. On the *physiologie*, consult. Paul Lacombe, *Bibliographie parisienne, tableaux de mœurs (1600-1880)*, Paris, 1887, pp. 122-36, and Édouard Maynial, *L'Époque réaliste*, Paris, 1931, pp. 40-47.

² Examples are *Las visitas* (1859), *Los buenos muchachos* (1867), and the collection *Tipos trashumantes* (1877).

³ For example, *Los españoles pintados por sí mismos*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1843-44. For a survey of collections of this kind, see W. S. Hendrix, "Notes on Collections of Types, a Form of *Costumbrismo*," *Hisp. Rev.*, I (1933), 208-21.

⁴ First published 1845-46, though written in piecemeal form from 1830; see Charles de Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de H. de Balzac*, Paris, 1879, pp. 208 ff.

In *Fisiología del baile* (1863) Pereda adopts on a miniature scale the manner of *Physiologie du mariage*. The article is an attack upon the public dance, which the author considers a breeding place of temptations engendered by the devil. The author's analytical, academic approach to the subject and his procedure of writing a treatise on a debatable issue vividly recall Balzac's dissertation on marriage. In lieu of citations of studies on similar topics, he quotes from a theologian, repeats popular maxims, and even calls upon history albeit in a loose and non-specific way, to support his view. Like Balzac also he states principles which he proceeds to demonstrate in proof of his theory, argues by means of questions and answers, and scatters numerous aphoristic remarks and professorial deductions throughout his essay. His summary of the question, "El baile es una república en que no tienen autoridad ni derechos los padres y los maridos sobre sus hijas y mujeres respectivas," and the subsequent *preceptos* under the titles of "Deberes de la mujer" and "Derechos del hombre" in their form and temper remind the reader of some of Balzac's numerous *préceptes* and axiomatic statements. Compare, for example, the following from the "Catéchisme conjugal": "Un mari ne doit jamais s'endormir le premier ni se réveiller le dernier," "L'homme qui entre dans le cabinet de toilette de sa femme est un philosophe ou un imbécile."⁶ Pereda, in fact, talking about the dance sounds very much like the youthful Balzac talking about marriage. Both give superficial and one-sided views of their subjects. But whereas Balzac is only partially serious, positing as he does some subtle observations on social relations and at the same time indulging in a humorous essay, Pereda is outspoken in a personal and prejudiced attack.

In two other short compositions Pereda followed the method of the *physiologie* in part. *Las bellas teorías* (1863) is both a narrative and an essay. By presenting a series of experiences of an idealistic youth, the author develops the theme of materialism in society. The story reminds one in a general way of *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale*, since it is essentially a demonstration, in an abstract manner, of a theory. It also contains the characteristic axiomatic remarks, in the form of a *resumen*—"El talento

⁶ *Esbozos y rasguños*, p. 7 (*Obras completas*, VII, 2a ed., Madrid, 1898).

⁷ *Physiologie du mariage*, Paris, Calmann Levy, 1897, p. 82.

es el árbitro soberano de la tierra"—and a *corolario*—"Sólo los necios tendrán hambre y frío"

La mujer del ciego (1870) is a moralistic essay attacking the modish display of women in public. The author states his opinions and proceeds methodically to substantiate his declarations. The composition resembles the *physiologie* in its argumentative style, its question and answer examination of the thesis, and its diffusion of authoritative observations. In a passage which bears a marked likeness to the general manner of writing in *Physiologie du mariage*, Pereda cites Balzac as an authority on marital affairs, using for his own purpose the latter's argument that, when a woman begins to assume independence in her own home and to disregard her husband's authority and opinions, she evinces symptoms of approaching conjugal infidelity.

El buey suelto (1877) was Pereda's last and most pretentious effort in line with Balzac's *physiologies*. Although this novel does not follow closely the latter's treatises, its similarity to *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* is clear. Apparently Pereda's intention was to use the method of *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* to refute the doctrine expressed in this work. Declaring in his prefatory remarks that he has as much right as others to discourse fancifully on the subject of matrimony, he sets out in an "ensayo de fisiología celibataria"⁹ to prove that the life of a bachelor is one of misery, a proposition contrary to that of Balzac. Balzac takes a hypothetical case of a married couple with which to demonstrate the import of the title chosen for his book. Caroline is made to serve as a synthesis of wives as Adolphe is of husbands.

⁹ *Esbozos y rasguños*, p. 74

⁸ *Esbozos y rasguños*, p. 206. The reference seems quite clearly to be to *Méditation VIII*, "Des premiers symptômes," of *Physiologie du mariage*.

⁹ "Dedicatorio," *El buey suelto*, p. 7 (*Obras completas*, II, 3a ed., Madrid, 1899). Pereda undoubtedly had Balzac in mind in writing *El buey suelto*, for he makes a point in the course of his novel of discussing, through his characters, Balzac's writings on marriage. But he could have been familiar, at least by name, with other French essays on the same theme, for example with the following *Physiologie du célibataire et de la vieille fille* by L. Couailhac, Paris, 1841, and *Physiologie de la vie conjugale et des mariés au treizième* by Arthur de St. Luc and P. Aymés, Paris, 1842 (Lacombe, *op. cit.*, pp. 124, 131). The first of these, a series of brief discursive chapters in light vein on the disadvantages of celibacy, has slight resemblance to Pereda's novel. I have not seen the second book.

The author writes an analytical essay much as he does in *Physiologie du mariage*, listing numerically various considerations and bringing in numerous aphoristic sayings and philosophical observations. To present a graphic view of his theory, he provides a catalogue of typical situations and episodes, *physiologies* in themselves, which serve more to illustrate an abstract principle than to tell a story. The narrative element of the book, then, is a thin thread held together only by the personages, and the book remains throughout essentially a treatise, although the second part, which shows the inevitable outcome of the marriage in question, does have something of a novelistic coloring.

In *El buey suelto* Pereda also takes a hypothetical case, that of a bachelor.¹⁰ He visualizes bachelors as a selfish group disdainful of marriage because of the evils reputedly accompanying it, and he calls his central character, Gedeón, an *egoísta* "en que se resumen todas las especies de egoístas."¹¹ He gives Gedeón's background, as Balzac does for Adolphe, and through the eyes of his protagonist he examines various aspects of marriage. Once Gedeón has decided to remain a bachelor, the author presents a catalogue of typical experiences, all of which expose the unhappy lot of a bachelor and "prove" the thesis. With the presentation of typical situations, however, the difference between the two writers becomes most noticeable. Balzac consistently treats the various occurrences with abstractness, whereas Pereda is concretely specific. It soon becomes clear that he is writing a novel rather than an essay, and as the experiences of Gedeón work cumulatively toward his own ruin, the author gives free rein to his liking for descriptive episodes, which include some *physiologies* of types. And since Pereda is more interested in telling a story than in writing a treatise, he does not regale his readers with numerous authoritative observations.

Although *El buey suelto* contains a few excellent scenes which display Pereda's talent as an artist in picturesque description, it is in essence a completely one-sided story, distorted to conform to a prejudiced viewpoint. Balzac, too, gives a one-sided view of his subject, since he presents only unpleasant aspects of matrimony,

¹⁰ F. Vézinet (*Les Maîtres du roman espagnol*, Paris, 1907, pp. 131-39) compares *El buey suelto* and *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* but confines his remarks to the contents and general nature of the works without attention to technique.

¹¹ *El buey suelto*, p. 12.

but he maintains in his semi-serious vein more equilibrium than Pereda. With whimsical dryness he unveils certain disagreeable truths, but his mood is basically playful, and *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* like *Physiologie du mariage* may be regarded as an exercise in humorous essayistic writing. Apparently Pereda started out with the intention of treating his theme in humorous vein, but, as he warmed up to his subject, his humor gave way to invective and sober moralizing, common faults in his satirical works. Thus, what might have been a fanciful *physiologie* became a sermon, which, with its baleful view of celibacy, was a defense of marriage.

Since there were numerous *physiologies* of the essay kind aside from those of Balzac, it is possible that Pereda was actuated by the popularity of these to write the compositions mentioned above. But he is closer to Balzac in the details of his technique than to the average writer of the genre in question. Furthermore, the fact that he refers to Balzac's *physiologies* in compositions (*La mujer del ciego* and *El buey suelto*) which bear definite marks of similarity to them strongly indicates the French novelist as his model in this kind of writing. There is little doubt that he admired Balzac, though disagreeing with some of his ideas. Curiously enough, he felt no desire to turn an attack upon the latter until 1877 (*El buey suelto*). A possible explanation for this is that the controversial atmosphere existing in Spain and the intense interest in novels of ideas around 1875-1880¹² stimulated Pereda to participate in the trend of the day by contributing a thesis novel in defense of one of his favorite themes—the sanctity of marriage.¹³ In so doing, he resurrected a target of attack from Balzac's satires. He was well aware that a confutation of the theme of *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* already existed in the same author's *Un ménage de garçon* (1842).¹⁴

Balzac's *physiologies*, although in a sense humorous essays, may be considered as forming a part of his general objective of studying contemporary society. Thus they fit into the vast scope of his

¹² See my article "The Spanish Novel of 'Ideas'. Critical Opinion (1836-1880)," *PMLA*, LV (1940), 544 ff.

¹³ With *Don Gonzalo González de la Gonzalera* (1878) and *De tal palo tal astilla* (1879) Pereda completed a trio of thesis novels, embracing the three subjects on which he was most easily drawn into combat: the home, politics, religion.

¹⁴ Cf. *El buey suelto*, p. 158.

realistic method Pereda had no such objective in mind His *fisiologías* served merely as outlets for personal convictions But they do display one of his important realistic traits as a novelist—an inclination to analytical and methodical thinking He was fond of analysis in characterization, of a systematic presentation of his material (for example, in exposition and description), and of argumentation and reasoning in general He found the *physiologie* peculiarly adapted both to his satirical mood and to his analytical bent.

SHERMAN EOFF

Washington University

BEATRICE'S EYES

After Dante's immersion in Lethe the four Cardinal Virtues lead him in front of the Griffin and tell him to look into¹ Beatrice's eyes, singing "See that thou spare not thy sight. we have placed thee before the *smeraldi* whence Love shot his weapons at thee of old"² The later Italian, and most other, commentators resolutely combat the implication that Beatrice's eyes were green;³ and insist that only symbolic intent is to be considered.

Personally, I have no objection to Beatrice's having had green eyes, and yet for Dante to tell us so, in any fairly definite way, would be almost to violate his custom of never vouchsafing any concrete and objective description of her person Almost, but not quite; for once, in the *Vita Nuova*, he arrests us with the words 'Color of pearls has she, almost, as much as is becoming to lady';⁴

¹ Dante regularly speaks, especially in the *Paradiso*, of looking into Beatrice or into her eyes cf, e g, *Par*, II, 22, xv, 34, xviii, 8 f, xxviii, 11

² *Purg*, xxxi, 115 ff "Fa che le viste non risparmi Posto t'avem dinanzi alli smeraldi Ond' Amor già ti trasse le sue armi"

³ E g, Venturi: "*Agli smeraldi*, agli occhi di Beatrice rilucenti come smeraldi, e che al mirarli riereano; non ch' ella avesse gli occhi di gatto!" Tommaseo even guesses that Dante might have meant 'blue!' "*Agli smeraldi*, agli occhi. 'Smeraldi' disse sopra 'giocondo lume'; o anche perché gli occhi di lei erano d'azzurro chiaro. . ."

⁴ xix, 11. "Color di perle ha quasi, in forma quale Convene a donna aver, non for misura"

this was written in her lifetime and when both were in their early twenties and was said with a boldness which never was to appear again in his descriptions of Beatrice. But there follows almost immediately a statement which adds a new more covert item of personal description, and which has never to my knowledge been brought into relief after saying that from her eyes issue glowing spirits of love, he adds 'You see Love painted (*pinto*) in her face, there where no one can look at her fixedly'—and this, the prose explanation tells us, means her 'mouth, which is the end of love.'⁶ This still looks rather abstract and intangible, until one realizes that it may mean, very definitely, her red lips for red is love's 'color.' We took it for granted all the time that her lips were red, and we should have been more grateful to know unmistakably what color her eyes were, or whether her hair was blonde, like the Lady Petra's,⁷ or was dark—as would have been more becoming with her little-girl dress of blood-red.⁸ So what have we gained? What have we wrested from the secretive Dante?

Little, except two, which with Beatrice's emerald eyes makes three, colors—the familiar triad of the three "theological colors," white, green and red, which play so large a part, both explicitly and implicitly, in all Dante's work.⁹

So that again we wonder whether Beatrice's 'emerald' eyes were only symbolically green!¹⁰

HERBERT D. AUSTIN

University of Southern California

⁶ *Ibid.*, 12 "Voi le vedete Amor pinto nel viso, Là 've non pote alcun mirarla fiso."

⁷ *Ibid.*, 20 "dico de la bocca, la quale è fine d'amore"

⁸ *Rime*, ciii, 63

⁹ *V N*, ii, 3

⁹ See *MLN*, xxxix, 340 ff., "The Three Garments," for another none-too-evident presentation of the same color symbolism

¹⁰ There is a further tantalizing hint of greenness (or blue-greenness?) in connection with Beatrice's eyes soon after the *Purgatorio* passage *Par*, i, 65-69 'I in her fixed my eyes, Within her "aspect" (gaze, look, vision, eyes) I made myself such as Glaucus made himself in tasting of the herb that made him in the sea consort of the other gods.' Uguccione da Pisa ends his section on *glaucus*, -a, -um, with the sentence "That *glaucus* is said for green, or blackish, is derived from Glaucus god of the sea, for the color of the sea is green, and blackish" ("Quod *glaucus* dicitur viridis, vel subniger, tractum est a Glaucio deo maris, nam color maris viridis est et subniger.")

"SOUNDING BRASS"

Dante's two uses of the word *rame* both refer to antiquity ¹ (1) the trunk of the Old Man of Crete, who represents the Four Ages of mythology, is of *rame*, signifying the "Brazen" Age, ² and (2) the hollow metal bull, work of Perillus, in which the Sicilian tyrant Phalaris burned culprits alive was made of *rame* 'As the Sicilian bull, that bellowed first with the lament of him—and that was right—who had tuned it with his file, used to bellow with the voice of the afflicted man, so that, although it was of *rame*, yet it appeared transfixed by the pain,' ³ so the voice of Guido da Montefeltro sounded as it forced its way to the tip of the flame that enclosed him.

Two, at least, of the early commentators—Boccaccio and the Anonimo Fiorentino—say that *rame*, is a 'sonorous metal', but, unexpectedly, they make this statement in connection with the first passage, instead of the second where one would look for it. The Anonimo says simply, 'Since *rame* is a sonorous metal,' ⁴ but Boccaccio offers an explanation for the seemingly cryptic allusion "since *rame* is a more sonorous metal than either of the before-mentioned (the gold and silver of the first two Ages of Man), men became more famous among themselves, and of greater renown" ⁵ This still remains rather puzzling, until we see that its source is in, or is related to, St. Jerome's explanation of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, ⁶ which was the model for Dante's Old Man of Crete, Jerome says of the "brass" belly and thighs 'This material (*aes*, = *rame*) is more vocal than all metals, and resounds afar with its ringing. And therefore in Daniel, in the image which was composed of gold, silver, *aes*, and iron, the reign

¹ As does his one use of *aes*

² *Inf*, xiv, 108 "Poi è di rame infino alla forcata"

³ *Inf*, xxvii, 7-12: "Come 'l bue cicilian che mugghiò prima Col pianto di colui, e ciò fu dritto, Che l'avea temperato con sua lima, Mugghiava con la voce dell'affitto, Sì che, con tutto che fosse di rame, Pur el pareva dal dolor trafitto"

⁴ "Poi che il rame è uno metallo sonoro, "

⁵ " , siccome il rame è più sonoro metallo che alcuno de' predetta, divennero gli uomini fra sè medesimi più famosi, e di maggior rinomèa "

⁶ Daniel, ii, 31 ff

of Alexander and of the Greeks is indicated in the similitude of the *aes*, that the eloquence of the Greek tongue might be signified.⁷ And the basis and background of this pronouncement concerning *aes* is almost surely the Apostle Paul's famous verse "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."⁸ Two centuries after St Jerome, Isidore of Seville adds to his condensation of Pliny's remarks about *aes* a few of his own, among them "Of all the metals *aes* is the most vocal."⁹

All of which shows in general, that not only theological, ethical, and historical, but also literary echoes in the Middle Ages should be suspected of being scriptural, and, in particular, that St Paul is probably to be given the ultimate credit for Boccaccio's remark about the meaning of *aes* in the Old Man of Crete

HERBERT D. AUSTIN

University of Southern California

AN IMMEDIATE SOURCE FOR *FAERIE QUEENE*, BK V, PROEM

Not often can one see the actual mechanics of Spenser's borrowings. The opportunity to do so is, however, afforded by the Proem to Book V of *The Faerie Queene*, wherein Spenser turns to his own use certain ideas contained in the first few pages of Loys Le Roy's *Interchangeable Course, or Variety of Things in the Whole World* (London: Charles Yetsewert, 1594),¹ a work otherwise quite opposed to the Poet's idea of degeneration.

⁷ *Commentariorum in Ezechielem* lib. XII, cap. XI (*PL*, XXV, 373 (old 465)) "Haec materia cunctis metallis vocalior est, et tinnitu longe resonat. Unde et Daniel, in imagine quae erat ex auro, argento, aere, ferroque compacta, regnum Alexandri atque Graecorum in aeris similitudine demonstratur, ut Graecae linguae eloquentia signaretur."

⁸ I Cor., XIII, 1 "Si linguis hominum loquar, & Angelorum, charitatem autem non habeam, factus sum velut aes sonans, aut cymbalum tinniens."

⁹ *Etym.*, XVI, XX, 11 "Inter omnia metalla aes vocalissimum est."—Still two centuries later, Rabanus Maurus quotes Paul's verse, with a different explanation of the significance of *aes* in it (*De Universo*, lib. XVII, cap. XIV—in *PL*, CXL, 477). "In aere autem vanitas, vel inanitas fidei exprimitur. ut est illud in Apostolo: *Factus sum velut aes sonans*."

¹ A translation, by Robert Ashley, of *La Vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers* (Paris, 1575)

Le Roy's book, which develops the cyclic theory of successive periods of growth, maturity, and decay, differs from many such treatises on mutability in that it rejects the notion of primitive perfection (the Golden Age, etc.) and argues that modern times have the advantage of ancient. Its method throughout is comparative and historical, the comparisons between nations and between individuals being made in a fashion somewhat suggestive of that followed by Plutarch's *Lives*. As a prime document in the history of the quarrel of the ancients and moderns it has received surprisingly little attention.

In the first of the twelve books into which the work is divided, Le Roy proposes to discuss the "alteration of all things in the worlde, together with the causes of the principall chaunges and varieties, to be perceued as well in the superiour, as in the inferiour part thereof,"² and launches at once into an examination of the "wandring and inconstancie" of the heavenly bodies from the time of Ptolemy to his own day. In the course of his discussion he reaches the conclusion that the world is about to pass the revolution of the "great yere" of the Ancients, and that the changes attendant upon that event have left the present days in parlous state.

Neuer were the Sunne and Moone eclipsed more apparantly; neuer were seene so many comets, and other impressions in the aire, neuer did the Sea and the riuers so violently ouerflowe their bankes, neuer haue bin heard such earthquakes, neuer were borne so many and so hydeous monsters. Neither hath there euer beene since the memory of man, so many and so often changes to come to passe in Countries, Nations, Maners, Lawes, Estates, and Religions.³

A hasty thumbing of the first few pages of Le Roy could, then, easily leave one in a mood to feel that the world was hopelessly topsy-turvy. And that is precisely the mood of Spenser's first stanza in the Proem:

So oft as I with state of present time
The image of the antique world compare,
When as mans age was in his freshest prime,
And the first blossome of faire vertue bare,
Such oddes I finde twixt those, and these which are,
As that, through long continuance of his course,
Me seemes the world is runne quite out of square
From the first point of his appointed sourse,
And being once amisse, growes daily wourse and wourse.

² Sig. B1.

³ Sigs. B2v-B3.

It should be noted that on the same page with his gloomy prospectus for the immediate future, Le Roy mentions "the fables of . Deucalion, and Pyrrha," though not, it is true, in the connection given them by Spenser (St 11). Still, the juxtaposition is suspiciously unlike mere coincidence, and as a suggestion dropped into the questing mind of a highly imaginative poet it certainly need not lead to identical use of figure.

Beginning with St. 14 Spenser explains that the worsening of sublunary affairs is attributable to the changing positions of the heavenly bodies with reference to the equinoctial points, a change due to precession of the equinoxes.⁴ The poet reaches the zenith of his moan in Stt VII-VIII

Ne is that same great glorious lampe of light,
That doth enlumine all these lesser fyres,
In better case, ne keepes his course more right,
But is miscaried with the other spheres
For since the terme of fourteene hundred yeres,
That learned Ptolomæ his hight did take,
He is declyned from that marke of theirs
Nigh thirtie minutes to the southerne lake,
That makes me feare in time he will us quite forsake

And if to those Egyptian wisards old,
Which in star-read were wont have best insight,
Faith may be given, it is by them told,
That since the time they first tooke the sunnes hight,
Foure times his place he shifted hath in sight,
And twice hath risen where he now doth west,
And wested twice where he ought rise aright

Le Roy's statement of the idea contained in Stanza VII, though not agreeing with Spenser in the degree of solar aberiation—the precise meaning of either is hard to determine—is cast in language suggestively close to Spenser's:

The course of the sunne is no more such as it was wont to be in old time; neither are there the same points of the Solstices and Equinoxes. but within this fourteene hundred yeres since Ptolomey liued, who was a most diligent obseruer of the course of the world, it is come neerer vnto the earth then at that time it was, about twelue degrees.⁵

⁴ Le Roy, sig B3. "Moreouer, they say, that al the parts of the Zodiacke and the whole signes haue changed their places; and that the earth is remoued from his first situation, being not entirely & absolutely (as afore it was) the center of the world."

⁵ Sig B3.

For a parallel to the ideas expressed in St viii, it is necessary to look a few pages farther into the text of Le Roy. In that section of the Fourth Book which treats "Of the Power, Learning, and other excellency of the Egyptians" we read

HERODOTVS the historian speaking in his Euterpe of the Egyptians affirmeth That it was giuen him to vnderstande by the Priestes, that in three hundred fortie and one generations they had so many Kinges, and highe Priestes, and that in the space of one thousande three hundred and fortie yeeres, *the sunne had foure times changed his accustomed course, arising twice in the west part, and setting also twice in the East* *

The correspondence of the italicized portion of the foregoing quotation with lines 5-7 of Spenser's stanza could hardly be closer. Such exact correspondence of ideas and wording, especially when the passages all occur within relatively brief compass, should put beyond doubt the immediate provenience of Spenser's information. And if, as has been suggested,⁷ the proems to the various books of *The Faerie Queene* were late compositions, polished off while the author prepared his poem for the press, we may also catch a glimpse of Spenser hungrily bringing himself up to date on current literature.

One final word. Le Roy's book has not, so far as I am aware, ever been considered—as it assuredly deserves to be—in connection with the Garden of Adonis⁸ passage and the Mutabilitie Cantos. It would throw much light on both.

JOHN LEON LIEVSAY

Stanford University

MORE IRISH WORDS IN SPENSER

Although the fragmentary version of Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* printed by Renwick¹ from the Public Record Office MS is the roughest of rough drafts, it affords some

* Sigs H^v-H², my italics

⁷ *E g.*, by Josephine Waters Bennett, *The Evolution of "The Faerie Queene"* (Chicago, 1942), p. 48 (following G. L. Craik).

⁸ Cf., for example, sigs Z3^v-Z4 of *The Interchangeable Course*

¹ Pp. 258-63. All the quotations from Spenser discussed below are drawn from p. 260. Dr. Rudolf Gottfried informs me that these words are correctly transcribed from the MS in Renwick's edition. For Spenser's other Irish words, see *JEGP*, XLII (1943), 502-06.

idea of the extent of Spenser's familiarity with his subject. However it may be criticized in the light of twentieth-century scholarship, there can be no doubt that Spenser knew more about the Irish and their language than did most of his fellow Undertakers, and that some of his opinions were held by reputable Irishmen in Spenser's day and even later.

IRISH AND WELSH WORDS Spenser's theory that southeastern Ireland was "peopled from the Brittons"² has been abandoned only recently by modern scholars. See, for example, Kuno Meyer's conclusion that "whether we take history for our guide, or native tradition, or philology,—we are led to no other conclusion but this that no Gael ever set foot on British soil save from a vessel that had put out from Ireland,"³ or Cecile O'Rahilly's "To sum up, the Goidels came from Gaul direct to Ireland, not across Great Britain."⁴

"as fyre is in Welshe Tane in Iryshe Tuunnye"

"Iryshe Tuunnye" represents a reasonable attempt on Spenser's part to indicate the pronunciation of *Ir teine*, the common word for "fire," which is cognate with *W tân*, "fire," Spenser's "Welshe Tane." See further the comment on *teine* in *NED*, s. v. *Beltane*, and Vallancey's *Collectanea*, No. XII, pp. cxxvi f. As late as 1747 the spellings *tine* and *tineadh* occur in the same manuscript⁵ almost side by side.

"an heigh lande in Welshe and Iryshe Tarbert"

Spenser seems erroneously to have associated *tarbert* with *Ir torr* = *W. twr*, "heap or pile," hence his rendering "heigh lande."

² Spenser here follows Camden (*Britannia*, ed. 1590, p. 682; ed. 1594, p. 646). *ita ex Britannia nostra primos incolas commigrasse in aperta est*. From Camden, too, Spenser drew his opinion that the Irish stories of the *Leabhar Gabhala* are "mere fables and verie Melisian lyes" (Renwick, p. 56), Camden's phrase (ed. 1594, p. 643) is *nugae Milesiae*. But see also Holinshed, ed. 1587, p. 49a65 ff. For a fuller discussion of the subject see my "Spenser, Holinshed, and the *Leabhar Gabhala*," *JEGP.*, XLIII (1944), 390-401, particularly p. 396.

³ *Transactions Hon Soc of Cymmrodorion*, 1895-96, p. 69.

⁴ *Ireland and Wales* (London 1924), p. 34.

⁵ J. H. Lloyd, *Gadelica* I (1912), 23, nos. 53, 54. Edward Lhuyd, *Archaeologia Britannica* (1707), p. 67, in his "Comparative Vocabulary" gives "Ignis . . . Tân; . . . Ir. Teine."

He may have drawn his assumption from Camden's "LITTVS ALTVM, vbi nunc TARBARTH, id est Britannicè terra minùs profunda"⁶ But Ir *toubheart*, *tairbheart* (< *to-air-ber-, Pedersen, *Vergl Gramm der Kelt Sprachen*, II, 465) means "isthmus" or "neck of land"⁷

Two places named Tarbert must have been known to Spenser. The first, now Belturbet, appears three times in the *View* (Globe ed., pp. 616b, 652a, 664b). From there O'Donovan wrote in 1836: "Of the Town of Belturbet I find no record except that it was a castle built by Hugh Connallach O'Reilly, A. D. 15— The ford which this castle commanded is called by O'Sullivan *Bel-Tarbert* and Latinised *Os Tarberti*. The castle was called by the Irish *Causlen Toubert*." ⁸ The old name seems to have been *Bél Atha Charbad*, "Mouth of the Ford of Chariots"⁹

But nearer to Spenser at Kilcolman was Tarbert in Munster, a seignory on the Shannon, Co. Limerick, which was constantly under dispute or discussion among the Munster Undertakers. It appears in an abstract in the State Papers which refers also to Spenser's own holdings¹⁰

"Curve Cosh eribord is bothe Welshe and Iryshe"

Curve Cosh eri (sic?) *bord* appears to be a list of four Irish words.

(1) *Curve* is perhaps Spenser's anglicized spelling for Ir *cúrm*, a common word for "ale,"¹¹ cognate with W. *cwrw*, earlier *cwrf*,

⁶ *Britannia*, ed. 1594, p. 635, rendered by Gibson (1695), col. 947 "called now, as it seems, *Tarbarth*, for there the shore rises to a great height (sic)." See the explanation in Wm. Baxter's *Glossarium Antiquitatum Britannicarum* (1719), p. 154, s. v. *Litus Altum* (pro *Tarva ardh vel Altus venter*).

⁷ On the Scottish Tarberts, see W. C. Mackenzie, *Scottish Place-Names* (1931), p. 151; J. B. Johnston, *Place-Names of Scotland*, 3d ed. (1934), p. 307.

⁸ *Ordnance Survey Letters, Cavan and Lestrim*, p. 4.

⁹ *Ordn. Surv. Letters, Fermanagh*, p. 7.

¹⁰ *Calendar of State Papers for Ireland*, 167.45 (1592), p. 60, see also *OSPI*, 202. 1. 79, 2. 36 (1598), pp. 81-2, 145, *et passim*.

¹¹ *Cúrm* (used of an ale no longer brewed) was still current among the Irish bards after Spenser's time, cf. the poem by Art Og O'Keefe in "the Contention of the Bards" (L. McKenna, *Iomarbhágh na bFíleadh*, II, 228,6), where two MSS have *cúirb*. In Lhuyd, *Archaeol. Brit.* (1707), p.

curwf, *cwyf* (< Old Celtic **kwmên* see Stokes, *Urkeltscher Sprachschatz*, pp 93-4). Again, it may be that Spenser's attention was drawn to the Welsh *curuf* while reading Camden.¹² The first three editions of the *Britannia* (cf ed 1590, p 21) have "*Cervisiam* ad *Keurch*, 1. auenam, è qua potum illum Britannii multis in locis conficiunt" But the 1594 edition adds to this (p 20) "vel potius ad *Curwf*, 1. quam *Alam* [English "ale"] dicimus"

(2) *Cosh* stands for Ir *cos*, g *coise*, "foot," cognate with W *coes* (cf. Lat *coxa*) See Stokes, *Urkeltscher Sprachschatz*, p 89 *Cosh* appears in the Irish place-name *Cois Mánghe*, Spenser's "our rich Coshma, / Now made of Maa," *CCCHA* 522 *Cois* (pronounced *Cosh* or *Cush*) is a dative form meaning "at the foot (of), beside", *Cois Mánghe* thus means "beside (or along) the Mauge River." Due east of Tarbert, it was called also *Mag Máige*, "the plain of the Mauge" Adare in Coshma was held on a 21-year lease by Sir Henry Wallop from 1586 until his death in 1599. See *CSPI*, 127-28 (1586), etc.

(3) *Eri* offers several possible solutions, from which it is impossible to select the word Spenser intended It is most likely that he was thinking of *Eire* (*Ériu*, g. *Éirenn*), the name for Ireland,¹³ and what has generally been considered its Welsh cognate *Iwerddon*¹⁴ But there are other possibilities He may have meant W.

47, the entry "Cervisia, Kurv, kuruv, 'Ale, Bee,' " omits Ir *cúirm*, which appears later (p 160), s v *Symposium*, as "koirm"

¹² Gottfried, *ELH*, x (1943), 122, has shown that Spenser used either the 1590 or 1594 edition of the *Britannia*, on other grounds I had already concluded that he used the 1594 edition.

¹³ This spelling of *Eire* is found as late as 1822, when O'Connor's *Chronicles of Eri* appeared in London. More significant is the fact that Sir James Ware, who published Spenser's *View* in 1633, also uses this form of the word in his opening discussion of the names for Ireland; cf. *Antiquitates Hibernicae*, 2d ed, 1658, p 2 *Ex alterutro fonte* [*Hiar* "the West" or *Iberis*] emanare videntur *Ierne*, *Hierna*, *Juverna*, *Iris*, *Bernia*, *Overnia*, & voc *Hibernica*, *Eri* *Hic enim nominibus Hibernia olim etiam vocabatur Ab Eri, Hibernus Erigena dicitur, & ita olim Johannes Scotus, Scriptor antiquus seculi nom, Erigena vulgò appellabatur Sunt qui ab Ebero Hispano, uno è Milesii filius, alii, qui ab Herimone Eberi fratre ducant.*

¹⁴ See J Morris-Jones, *Welsh Grammar*, 77, 153; Pedersen, *Vergil Gramm der Kelt Sprachen*, II, 109 The most satisfactory discussion of the name *Ériu* is by O'Rahilly, in *Ériu*, xiv (1943), 7-28, on W. *Iwerddon*

eira, "snow" = Ir *oidhre*, which however means "ice"¹⁵ It is conceivable that he had in mind Ir *árem* later *áreamh*, "number," cognate with W *eirif*, if so, he should have anglicized it *eriv* It is not likely that he intended *Coshern*, which is elsewhere in the *View* spelled *Cosshene*, *Cossurh*,¹⁶ as Ir *cóisir* (*JEGP*, XLII, 503) has no Welsh cognate Nor has *eire*, "burden" (Lhuyd, 1707, Dinneen *eire*, *eireadh*)

(4) Ir *bord*, "table," is W *bwrd*. Both are early borrowings from OE *bord*¹⁷ In his own poetry Spenser preferred *bord* to *table* (< Lat *tabula*), which in its present sense in English came into use as early as the fourteenth century

IRISH AND SAXON WORDS Spenser's theory that "Irelande received much people afterwarde from the Saxons" has more to recommend it than has his theory of British migration But he could have selected better examples of words which Irish and "Saxon" had in common

"Marh in Saxon is a horse, marrah in Iryshe is a horseman"

This statement is substantially correct "Marh in Saxon" is OE *mearh*, g. *mēares*, "marrah in Iryshe" is Ir *marcach*, g. *marcaigh*.¹⁸ For exact parallelism Spenser should have compared Ir. *marc*, g. *marc*, "horse." There is no OE word cognate with Ir. *marcach*, which is inadequately represented by Spenser's "marrah."

"to ryde] in Iryshe is *gemanus* and so in Saxon, or a comen person."

see pp 9-11 Before Spenser wrote his *View* the names for Ireland were much discussed by Holinshed, Camden, and other writers

¹⁵ Dinneen, *Irish-English Dictionary* (1927), s v *oighear*, *oighreadh*. The pronunciation of earlier Ir *aighreadh* could be expected to approximate Spenser's *eri* Lhuyd, *op. cit* (1707), p 4, has the entry "W Ehra, Snow, Ir Eróg & Oireóg, Ice"

¹⁶ Renwick, p. 46, Globe ed, p 623b Though the reading *Coshern* would seem untenable, it is worthy of note that the sequence *Curve Coshern bord* consists of words that are all related to feasting Lhuyd in his Dictionary, *op. cit.*, pp. 312 ff., explains *Coisir*, *Cosreach* as "A parish feast or wake"

¹⁷ Stokes, *Trans Philol Soc* 1888-90, p. 428 Lhuyd, p. 160, gives "Tabula, burdh"

¹⁸ Cf. also the rarer *marcaid*, M. Joynt, *Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language*, Royal Irish Academy (1932), *M*, col 63 = Dinneen's later *marcaidhe*.

There is some confusion here. The lacuna in the MS suggests that "to ryde" may belong with the preceding portion of the text. Was Spenser thinking of OE *gemāne*, *gemāna*, *gemānnes*, "common, community"? (Cf Lat *communis*). If so, there is no Irish cognate. OE **geo-man(n)* (< *geong-mann*?) does not occur in extant texts, but that the word may have existed is strongly suggested by ME. *zoman*, *zeman* (cf. *NED*, s v *yeoman*). Ir. *gíománach*, "horseboy," is, as I have already pointed out,¹⁹ borrowed from English *yeoman*, which may be what Spenser intended by "a commen person."

Spenser's fanciful etymologies for Irish surnames in the P. R. O. MS have been discussed in *JEGP*, XLII, 506-7. Other defects have been noted by Renwick, pp. 263-5. But in Spenser's defense it should be observed not merely that the P. R. O. version represents discarded matter, but that Spenser may never have considered his *View of the Present State of Ireland* ready for publication during his lifetime.²⁰ Indeed, Spenser's restraint appears greatly to his credit when it is recalled that more than two hundred years after Spenser's death Charles O'Connor and Vallancey, who had far less excuse than Spenser, were being hailed as authorities in the same field by virtue of writing reams of rubbish.

ROLAND M. SMITH

The University of Illinois

¹⁹ *JEGP*, XLII, 503, s v *cuille*.

²⁰ Renwick (p. 250) assumes, in connection with the entry of the *View* for publication in 1598, that the authorities "apparently forbade its printing." But there is no evidence that publication was forbidden. It is not at all impossible that Spenser was more interested in publishing *The Faerie Queene* and his other poems—certainly "among his first cares" (Renwick, p. 224)—than in going through the red tape of getting "further authority" for printing the *View*. Spenser, upon re-perusal of the manuscript, may have felt that it was not yet ready for publication, which he decided either to postpone or to drop.

WAD

One meaning of the word *wad* has escaped the attention of all English lexicographers and deserves resurrecting, if only for its occurrence in the ballad stanza that follows

I launched my boat in Largo Bay
And fishes caught I three
One for *wad* and one for hook,
And one was left for me

This stanza has been so long in my memory that the circumstances attending my introduction to it are completely obscured. I ran across the stanza, too, I feel, somewhere in my Icelandic work. Suspecting from "Largo Bay"¹ that the ballad was Scottish, I searched, as a matter of interest, though not exhaustively, through most of the northern and Scottish ballad collections. Some time ago I was rewarded by finding a variation of it in "The Fisher Lasses' Rant"²

We laid our lines in Largo Bay,
And we got fishes nine,
Three to roast, and three to boil,
And three to bait our line

This is the seventh of sixteen stanzas, each with a refrain. The gist of the entire ballad might be summarized thus. As a group of fishermen approach the shore, they espy the tapster's lass, who seeing them, orders that her hose and shoes be cleaned, and brought to her so that she can go down to see the bonny lad who has "laid his love" on her. The lad tells her she must sell her beads and her half-silk gown to buy "a fishline." The stanza quoted then follows. With the three fish reserved for bait they catch a big skate, which is put into the creel "till Saturday" to reserve as, or to barter for, the Sunday meal, but while they are dancing and making merry, a "customer" "customs" [empties] the creel of fish, and presumably there goes the Sunday meal.

Maidment states that he has taken it from a stall sheet, or

¹ Largo Bay is an inlet of the Firth of Forth, County of Fife

² Maidment, James, *Scottish Ballads and Songs*, Edinburgh, 1859, pp 50-53

broadside, printed at Glasgow at the end of the 18th century, and that the original ballad has never been, as far as he could be certain, included in any collection.³

Be that as it may, it is obvious that the stanza in Maidment is considerably simplified in diction and content and must be a somewhat later version of one that existed in oral tradition from way back. The obscurity of the word *wad* plus the setting aside of part of the catch for the hook and wad—both seem now rather difficult to explain. As the ballad, of which this obscure stanza was a part, moved about, the divisions of the catch became the same three piles, but piles for roasting, boiling, and baiting.

The omission of this *wad* from Webster's *New International Dictionary*, the *NED*, Wright's *English Dialectal Dictionary*, Jamieson's *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*, and from all other and lesser works constitutes a slur upon a word of old and distinguished lineage, especially when one recalls the disembodied locutions that have been preserved in these works as part of the historical record of the language.

Wad here means "fishline" and comes straight from Old Norse *caðr*, which has two meanings in the sagas (1) a fishingline, and (2) a line for measuring.

Webster's *New International Dictionary* gives these two Norse meanings out of Cleasby-Vigfússon⁴ in the etymology of *wad* but cites in the definition of the word itself only the second: "A line, esp. one marked in land surveying; hence, a track; trace, line of direction. Dial Eng." It is the purpose of this note to show that the "fishline" meaning of *wad* came generally into the English language, too, for the use of it in the ballad points to a popular acquaintance with, or knowledge of, such a meaning at one time, and one would like to venture a wager that even now the word has currency in the speech of men who inhabit sections of Scotland and the outlying islands where Norsemen once ravaged and later settled.

Absolute confirmation of the meaning of *wad* in the ballad stanza does not rest solely upon etymological grounds, however, for the same formula or ritual used in dividing or reckoning the catch

³ *Ibid.*, p. 50

⁴ Cleasby, Richard and Vigfússon, Gudbrand, *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1874.

comes down to us in the Icelandic *Saga of the Foster-brothers* as the following excerpt will show ⁵

Ólafur konungur mælti "Framarr hefir þú þá gert um vígin á Grænlandi enn fiskimaðrinn kallar aðausn vera fiskinnai, því at hann kallast leysa sik, ef hann dregr fisk fyrir sik, enn annan fyrir skip sitt, þriðja fyrir öngul, fjórða fyrir vað"

[Olaf the king said more hast thou done of killing in Greenland than the fisherman considers as compensation for his fishing because he believes that he has quitted himself of his fishing if he draws up a fish for himself, another for his boat, a third for his hook, and a fourth for his line]

To clarify this short passage lifted from the saga, I might add that immediately preceding this passage Thormod has been boasting of five killings in Greenland, to which King Olaf replies that hunting seems to have been good or the hunter daring, for Thormod has killed one man more than a fisherman must catch fish to prove himself a good fisherman or to feel himself rewarded for his labor and outlay.

Under the entry *vaðr*, the Icelandic dictionary ⁶ cites another fish count . . . draga fisk annan fyrir öngul hinn þriðja fyrir vað [. . . draw up another fish for the hook and the third for the line]

It is interesting to note that one fisherman counts his catch by separating it into three piles and another into four, but that in both cases the hook and the line come in for a share. This fact suggests an allotment for overhead.

This assignment of the catch to the "hook and line" is thus traced to the Old Norse Sagas and remains a problem, beyond the scope of this English note. Interest has merely prompted me to engage in some idle social and economic speculation.

Norse contributions to the English vocabulary are too well known to be more than noted here. The fact that the Oxford does not have this meaning of *vað* is not the first discovered omission, of course, from that great storehouse, but I should like especially to rescue *vað* and find a little niche for it by the side of "take," "they," etc., its somewhat more useful compatriots.

RALPH B. ALLEN

University of Pennsylvania

⁵ Ásmundarson, Valdmar, *Fóstbræðra Saga*, Reykjavík, 1899 [Íslendinga Sögur, Vol. 28], p. 118.

⁶ Cleasby-Vigfússon, *op. cit.*

ALYSOUN'S OTHER TONNE

An understanding of the structural dichotomy of the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* is essential to an appreciation of the metamorphosis of a sterile Pauline concept—"It is good for a man not to touch a woman"¹—into a work of art in the hands of Chaucer. With a modicum of seriousness and a wealth of humor, Alysoun astutely considers—through line 162—the validity of Church doctrines and prohibitions relative to the marriage state.² Chaucer's widow competently summons from Holy Writ and common sense evidence needful to refute important dogmas. The recital, however, is interrupted by the Pardoner, who confesses that the Wife's disquieting comments have left him undecided about the marriage question. "Yet hadde I levere wedde no wyf to-yeere!"³ She turns on the Pardoner and warns, "thou shalt drynken of another tonne./ Er that I go, shal savoure wors than ale."⁴ No matter what the Wife had planned to say, she is committed to the task of supplying the inebriate Pardoner with "another tonne." Whereas Alysoun had at first questioned the Church's position on marriage as pronounced by St. Paul, St. Jerome and later churchmen, she now gravitates toward orthodoxy in recounting "ensamples mo than ten,"⁵ which are designed to help the Pardoner solve the problem marriage or celibacy.⁶ Thenceforth, the *Prologue* is dedicated to the estimable task of describing the situation likely to be encountered by the man *qui capit uxorem*.

¹ I Cor 7. 1.

² St. Paul's equivocal evaluation of celibacy and marriage formed the basis of St. Jerome's argument against the wedded state in *Epistola Adversus Iovinianum*, a tract which represents fairly enough the ecclesiastical attitude toward women and marriage in the fourteenth century.

³ Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1933), D, 168.

⁴ CT, D, 170-1.

⁵ CT, D, 179.

⁶ The apparent reversal of intention can best be explained perhaps with reference to the poet's desire to fit the component parts of the *Canterbury Tales* into a framework essentially dramatic. But see R. F. Jones, "A Conjecture on the Wife of Bath's Prologue," *JEGP*, xxiv (1925), 512-547. Jones argues persuasively that the *Prologue* through line 193 was originally preceded by the *Shipman's Prologue*, and that the whole served as an introduction to the *Shipman's Tale*.

The *qui capit uxorem* convention was by no means new, however, Chaucer was probably the first to cast a woman in the rôle of the ecclesiastical raconteur who invariably renders the recitation⁷ Theophrastus in *Aureolus liber de nuptiis* (quoted by St. Jerome in *Epistola Adversus Iovinianum*) had asked "an vir sapiens ducat uxorem"⁸ in preparation for a concise summary of the barriers to pleasurable conjugal relations. An unknown clerk in the Middle Ages used the convention in five lines of hexameters⁹

Qui capit uxorem capit absque quiete laborem,
Longum languorem, lacrimas, cum lite dolorem,
Pondus valde grave, verbosum vas sine clave,
Quod nulli claudit sed detegit omne quod audit
Uxorem duxi quod semper postea luxi

The *qui capit uxorem* introduction, probably as a result of the influence of Theophrastus, appeared in anonymous thirteenth-century French poems, which, needless to say, make no pretense of considering the question of marriage fairly. Hence, the convention in *Le Blasme des Femmes* is purely an introductory device¹⁰

Qui a fame prent compaignie,
Oiez s'il fet sens ou folie
Fame si engingne et deçoit
Celui qui plus l'aime et la croit,
Et fet son bon et son plesir,
Ele se paine du trahir

The *qui capit uxorem* poem which Chaucer probably had at hand during the composition of the *Prologue* was the prolix *Miroir de*

⁷ There is a strong possibility that Chaucer's assignment of the *qui capit uxorem* exposition to a shrewish woman is a delightful jest at the expense of the detractors of women who took their work seriously. This lecture given by a man of the Church, such as the Monk, would have been worth scarcely a second notice, but in the idiom of the Wife it is brilliantly ironic.

⁸ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, xxiii, col. 276. Likewise the Wife, *CT*, D, 176-7, "Then maystow chese whether thou wolt sippe/ Of thilke tonne that I shal abroche."

⁹ P. Meyer, "Les Manuscrits Français de Cambridge," *Rom.*, xv (1886), 330.

¹⁰ Achille Jubinal (ed.), *Jongleurs et Trouvères* (Paris, 1835), p. 79. Cf. *Des Femmes*, ed. Jubinal, *Nouveau Recueil de Contes, Dits, Fabliaux* (Paris, 1842), II, 330, "Quy femme prent à compaignie/ Verez si il fet sens u folie"; *Les prepatés des femmes*, Meyer, *loc. cit.*, "Oez, seignurs, e escutez/ E a ma parole entendez/ Ki en femme trop met sa cure/ Sovent serra saunz honure."

Manage of Eustache Deschamps. *Le Miroir* is a prodigious expansion of the *Aureolus liber de nuptus* with borrowings from Jean de Meun and St Jerome. Franc Vouloir, like the Pardoner, contemplates marriage, unable to decide the question for himself. he writes to the monkish Répertoire-de-Science.¹¹

Et pour ce qu'en ce po m'entens,
 Envoje ces lettres a ty,
 Et treshumblement te suppli
 Que sui ce me vueillez rescripre
 Chose qui me doye soufrire
 A congnoistre parfaitement
 Le bien, le mal ou le tourment,
 Qui de ce fait se puet despendre,
 Afin que de toy puisse aprendre
 Se c'est mon pourfit ou dommaige
 De moy bouter en mariaige,
 Ou de vivre sanz ce lien (ll 1086-97)

Repertoire's reply is a catalogue of antifeminist sentiments accumulated over a period of many centuries, but it follows essentially the same pattern as Alysoun's reply to the Pardoner,¹² who, like Franc Vouloir, would know the fate of one *qui capit uxorem* and who discovered on good authority, "Non est ergo uxor ducenda sapienti,"¹³ than which a better conclusion to the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* could scarcely be found. The prime difference between the polemical Latin and French works and the *Prologue* is Chaucer, who artistically camouflages a threadbare pattern with a merry account of a wife's adventures with five husbands.¹⁴

ARTHUR K. MOORE

U S. Signal Corps

¹¹ Deschamps, *Le Miroir de Mariage*, ed Gaston Raynaud, *Oeuvres Complètes*, SATF, ix, 1894, p 38

¹² Deschamps and Chaucer were indebted to substantially the same sources for antifeminist sentiments

¹³ Migne, *op cit*, col 276 Chaucer lets the reader make this deduction for himself. Of course, the Pardoner, like the "nuvel Gerusalemme" of *Couplets sur le Mariage*, P[aul] M[eyer], "Mélanges," *Rom*, xxvi (1897), 95, could have observed at the conclusion, "Ne prendrai nule, ço est la fin," but it was hardly necessary

¹⁴ *Lenvoy de Chaucer a Bukton* is a humorous *qui capit uxorem* poem. Chaucer fixes the direction of the *Prologue* by recommending it to Bukton as an aid to the solution of the marriage problem, "The Wyf of Bathe I pray yow that ye rede/ Of this matere that we have on honde" (ll 29-30)

"CHRESTIENS DE LA SAINCTURE"

In a chapter from a symposium recently published under the title *The Arab Heritage*,¹ Professor H. L. Savage of Princeton University presented a condensed translation of the report on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land which a French nobleman, Ogier eighth baron d'Anglure, performed in the year 1395, together with some highly interesting notes and remarks.² On p. 209, the French passage (§ 170, p. 41) "Et sachiés que Bethzel est moult peuplée des Chrestiens de la saincture plus que de Sariasins. Iceulx chrestiens labourent les vignes ou iceulx bons vins croissent" is rendered "In Bethzel the Christians 'of the Girdle,' or Christians of St. Thomas, had become expert winegrowers." Christians of St. Thomas, as is well known, is a current appellation of an Eastern Christian community, belonging to the Nestorian sect, which settled on the northwestern coast of India and traced its origin to the Apostle Thomas, a claim which of course lacks any serious historical foundation.

However, the same "Christians of the Girdle" are mentioned on p. 216, together with the Jews, as having in Jerusalem "certain places and streets where they reside," which were separated from the sections where the Moslems lived (§ 168, p. 40 of the French text). And on p. 217 we read that "The Christians of the Girdle are recognizable because they wear the coloured *kafieh*³ of a blue shade, and the Jews a yellow one."

It is quite obvious that the "Chrestiens de la saincture" are plainly the native Christians, who under the regulations of the Islamic law were obliged to distinguish themselves from the Moslems by wearing blue girdles (Arabic *zunnār*, from the Greek

¹ *The Arab Heritage*, by Philip K. Hitti and others. Edited by Nabih Amin Faris. Princeton University Press, 1944.

² "Fourteenth Century Jerusalem and Cairo through Western Eyes," pp. 199-220. The title of the French original edition is *Le Saint Voyage de Jérusalem du Seigneur d'Anglure*, publié par F. Bonnardot et A. Longnon. Paris, 1878 (Société des Anciens Textes Français).

³ This is not found in the original text (§ 174 *bis*, p. 43) which only mentions a kerchief (*faassel*). The French editors, and not the sire of Anglure, are responsible for the unfortunate introduction of the word *kafieh*, which is the headgear of the Bedouins and is not worn by city dwellers and farmers, as the Christians in Palestine were, and still are.

zōnariion) and turbans. The Jews had to wear yellow girdles and turbans. As is well known this odious sign spread from the Moslem countries into the Christian.⁴

Professor Savage was misled by the French editors of Ogier's travel report, who in the "Glossaire" (p. 133) explain the expression "Chrestiens de la sainture" as "de la confession de saint Thomas, apôtre des Indes" and add "Cette appellation provient de ce que saint Thomas reçut la ceinture que la Vierge laissa tomber en son Assomption." This misinformation goes back to the Italian report of the Florentine Simone Sigoli on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, via Cairo and Mount Sinai, in 1384.⁵ To be sure, Sigoli links the appellation "Christians of the Girdle" to the legend of St. Thomas when he recounts (p. 94-5) his visit to the church of St. Thomas in Babilonia, i. e., the town which the Arabs called al-Fustât (from the Latin *fossatum*) and which was located near a Byzantine fortress known as Babylon, it is now called Old Cairo, south of the modern Cairo. He adds "I Cristiani della cintura sono grandissima quantità di gente in molti paesi, e massimamente in India." Undoubtedly, Sigoli was misinformed by a local cicerone. However, he does not say that the Christians of the Girdle are only those who live in India but points out that they are found in many countries, and chiefly in India. Lacking accurate information about the Eastern Churches, he may have believed that all Eastern Christians belonged to the same denomination.⁶ Leonardo Frescobaldi, another Florentine who undertook

⁴ See A. S. Tritton, *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim subjects* (London, 1930), index s. v. *zunnâr* and especially pp. 115-26. The subject has been recently dealt with in a most learned and attractive manner by Miss Ilse Lichtenstaedter, "The Distinctive Dress of Non-Muslims in Islamic Countries," *Historia Judaica*, v (1943), 35-52.

⁵ *Viaggio al Monte Sinai* di Simone Sigoli. Testo di lingua . . . per la prima volta pubblicato con due lezioni sopra il medesimo, una di Luigi Fiacchi, e l'altra di Francesco Poggi. Firenze, 1829. Strangely enough, Bonnardot and Longnon (p. x) ignored this edition, and mentioned as the first edition of Sigoli's *Viaggio* that of Parma, 1865, and as a second that of Turin, 1875. I have been unable to see them.

⁶ The editor of Sigoli, Francesco Poggi, although he was poorly equipped with oriental scholarship, understood the above passage better than the two French scholars, and in his notes (p. 148) correctly identified the "Christians of the Girdle" with the Copts. Another passage in Sigoli's report (p. 11) is almost identical to Ogier's passage on the colors of the headgears of Moslems, Christians, Jews, and Samaritans.

the pilgrimage together with Sigoli and left an independent report on it,⁷ had a higher standard of education than his fellow-traveler on pp. 94-5 he gives a rather accurate list of the various Christian denominations in Cairo "Cristiani Latini, Greci, Nubini (i e, Nubians), Giorgiani, Tiopiani (i e, Ethiopians), Ermini (i e, Armenians), Cristiani di cintura" Although he also explains this appellation by the legend of the Holy Virgin's gift to St Thomas (evidently, his informant was the same as Sigoli's), he refrains from locating the "Christians of the Girdle" in India On pp 101-3 he states that they officiated in some of the Coptic churches in Old Cairo (and not only in that of St Thomas), and on pp 142 and 167-70 he mentions them in connection with Bethlehem⁸ and Damascus. In calling both the Copts, in Egypt, and the other Christian denominations, in Palestine and Syria, "Christians of the Girdle," Frescobaldi was quite correct

Although the detection of the ultimate origin of a mistake which was carried over from the misunderstanding of an obscure Florentine of the 14th century to the 19th century editors of a mediaeval French text and finally to a distinguished American scholar of our days⁹ may present a certain amount of interest for the methodology of our studies, the proper place to deal with such a topic would not be this periodical. However, some readers of *MLN* may be in a position to answer a question which, through his ignorance of Romanic studies, the present writer is unable to solve. The expression "Chrestiens de la sainture" is not listed in any French

⁷ *Viaggio di Leonardo di Niccolò Frescobaldi Fiorentino in Egitto e in Terra Santa*. Roma, 1818 The editor, who is not mentioned on the title page, was Guglielmo Manzì I was unable to see a more recent edition of Sigoli and Frescobaldi in the volume by C Gargioli, *Viaggi in Terra Santa di Leonardo Frescobaldi e d'altri del secolo XIV*, Firenze, 1862 Nothing of interest is found in A Gregorini, *Le relazioni in lingua volgare dei viaggiatori italiani in Palestina nel secolo XIV* (Annali della R Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Filosofia e Filologia, Vol. XI, 1896).

⁸ Here Frescobaldi seems to differentiate between the "Christians of the Girdle" and the Jacobites, although most Christians in Palestine belonged to that sect However, other Eastern Churches were also represented there

⁹ In a footnote on p 209 Professor Savage quotes the opinions of Professor Hitti, the renowned Arabic scholar from Princeton University, and Mr. Khalidi (if I identify him correctly, a highly educated member of a distinguished Moslem family in Damascus) who both doubted the correctness of the identification of the "Christians of the Girdle" with the Christians of St. Thomas from India.

dictionary, as far as I can see¹⁰ Was Ogier d'Anglure the only one who ever used it? If so, did he take it directly from an Arabian environment, or rather from an Italian source? Furthermore, how widely spread is the Italian expression "Cristiani della cintura?" Is it confined to Sigoli and Frescobaldi? An authoritative answer to these queries would certainly be welcome.

G. LEVI DELLA VIDA

University of Pennsylvania

LA VIE DE SAINT THOMAS BECKET, VERS 4941

L'érudit suédois Emmanuel Walberg a édité à deux reprises la biographie française de Saint Thomas Becket composée par Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, une grande édition a paru à Lund en 1922 dans les *Acta Reg Soc Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis* et une petite édition a paru à Paris en 1936 dans les *Classiques français du moyen âge*. Les vers suivants font partie de l'épisode où Henri le Jeune refuse de recevoir l'archevêque à Londres et lui fait signifier l'ordre de retourner à Cantorbéry et de ne pas en sortir.

Comandé s'est a Deu, e puis s'en returna
Enz emmi le chemin, la u il mienz erra,
Es viles e es bures les enfanz conferma.
Del cheval descendi la u hum les porta,
En nul liu de servir Deu grief ne li sembla

¹⁰ As Professor Spitzer kindly informed me, Tobler-Lommatzsch, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, has an entry "Chrestiens de la saincture" (*s v ceinture*), where the above expression is quoted only from d'Anglure's *Voyage* and wrongly explained, in accordance with the editors of it, as "Thomaschristen, Nestorianer". I am also indebted to Professor Spitzer for a reference to Du Cange's *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, *s v Christiani*, where "Christiani de cinctura" is mentioned from several sources from the early 14th century as referring to the Christians in Egypt and Palestine, and an almost correct explanation of this name from the girdle which they wore as a distinctive sign is given. I may call attention to the fact that Du Cange's reference to "Sanutus lib 2 pars 2 cap. 8 s a 1330" is incorrect. It should read "cap 9," and the date, which in the printed text is 12** (*sic*, with the omission of the tens), should be restored to 1249, since the historical event referred to is the capture of Damietta by Louis IX (see Marinus Sanutus Torsellus, *Liber secretorum fidelium crucis*, Hanoviae 1611, p 48).

Deu servi volentiers—n'i estuet alumer—
 Par tut la u s'estut as enfanz confermer
 Les chapeles poum qu'i sunt faites trover
 La fait Deus cius veer, suiz oir, muz parler,
 Leprus munder, les morz e revivre e aler ¹

Il s'en faut de beaucoup que personne jusqu'ici ne se soit occupé de l'interprétation du vers 4941. Dans la note qui s'y rapporte et qui se trouve à la page 294 de sa grande édition, Walberg a offert le commentaire suivant "Je suppose qu'il faut comprendre ce vers comme une allusion aux chandelles allumées par miracle, à Newington, dont parle Guillaume de Cantorbéry" A la page xc de l'introduction il répète cette allusion, mais là il suggère que la source principale est chez Edouard Grim

Quanto autem feivore fidei, quanto desiderii coelestis inflammatus amore redierit, ac si auditis quae quidem poterant terrere consolatus, testem tenemus gratiam sanitatum quae per illud iter coelitus monstrabatur, postquam ad superos sanctus martyr ascendit ²

Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence aurait amplifié considérablement le récit.

Walberg ne relève cet emploi de *alumer* ni dans l'un ni dans l'autre de ses glossaires ³ La leçon *alumer* se trouve dans le manuscrit *B* (de Wolfenbützel). Le copiste du manuscrit *H* (de Londres) s'est permis ici un écart individuel mais véniel Il s'est décidé à corriger le vers à son gré

Beu servi volentiers, ne l'estut eslumer

Autrement dit, dans le manuscrit-base il a dû voir *alurner*, ce qui en effet est la leçon fournie par le manuscrit *C* (de Cheltenham).⁴ On n'a pas d'autres variantes ici, mais on ne peut pas douter de

¹ J'ai changé la ponctuation des vers 4941-4943 qui ont été imprimés de cette façon par Walberg

Deu servi volentiers N'i estuet alumer
 Par tut la u s'estut as enfanz confermer,
 Les chapeles poum qu'i sunt faites, trover.

Tout le texte de la petite édition est presque identique à celui de la première édition; cf *MLN*, LII (1937), p. 285.

² J. C. Robertson, *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, II (London, 1877), p. 428; ce recueil occupe sept volumes dans la collection des *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*

³ H. Breuer, *Latbl. germ. rom. Phil.*, XLIV (1923), 366.

⁴ Id., *Zts. rom. Phil.*, XLIII (1923), p. 362.

l'authenticité de l'orthographe telle qu'elle est offerte par Walberg. Abstraction faite de la ponctuation, dans ce vers 4941 il ne fait que suivre ses devanciers Bekker et Hippeau, Tobler-Lommatzsch, I 319, en citant notre vers, se basent sur l'édition d'Hippeau, ils le donnent à côté de trois autres citations *Erec et Enide* 3644, *Le Chastement d'un pere a son fils* XI 52, et une chanson de Gautier de Dargies reproduite dans *Archiv für neu Spr. Lit.*, XLII (1868), p. 322, par Brakelmann et encore en 1912 par Huet. Le sens donné par Tobler-Lommatzsch, "(fig) jemand entflammen," convient fort bien à ces trois poèmes où il s'agit de la beauté extraordinaire d'une dame et où il y a un régime direct de *alumer*, mais le vers 4941 de notre poème y est mal placé.

Godefroy, Compl. vol. VIII, p. 94b, sous l'en-tête *alumer* (absolu), cite un exemple apparenté dans le *Roman de la Poivre* 436

Si voi ge bien sanz alumer

Il y en a deux chez La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, vol. I, p. 358a, qui offre une explication admirable, "le sens de ce verbe étoit encore absolu, lorsqu'on disoit figurément en parlant d'une chose claire et évidente

Il n'i covient pas alumer
Ci ne faut il pas alumer."

Le premier exemple est tiré du vers 551 de la *Bible* de Guiot de Provins, en 1861 Wolfart et San-Marte avaient essayé de l'expliquer par "alumer (absolute, *schloet* ein Licht) anzuzünden." Le deuxième exemple est tiré d'une histoire de France conservée dans le manuscrit du Roi, cote 6812 (actuellement Bibliothèque Nationale, ancien fonds français, 146) et publiée par Buchon dans la Collection des chroniques nationales françaises, IX (1827). Enfin Lattre, dans son historique du verbe, a trouvé une citation supplémentaire dans le *Roman de Renart*, branche XXI vers 150.

Ne m'i estuet point alumer

Dans l'édition de Méon, vol. I, p. 361, on lit cette définition. "regarder fixement."

Cela posé, il reste à préciser l'acception absolue du verbe. On se rend compte que partout le verbe se présente dans une négation de la nécessité ou de la volonté d'approfondir le sujet. Il y a pour ainsi dire un sous-entendu psychologique qui est intentionnel chez l'auteur; il a envie de passer vite sur une idée, ce n'est pas la peine

de s'arrêter davantage, à quoi bon dire et redire ce qui va de soi? Le lecteur peut se passer facilement d'une explication détaillée ou d'une énumération étendue, certainement il comprend à demi-mot. Par conséquent on pourrait donner à ces cinq cas de l'emploi négatif de *alumer* la nuance "insister davantage, dire quelque chose de superflu."

RAPHAEL LEVY

Louisiana State University

READINGS FROM *PARISE LA DUCHESSE*

The thirteenth-century romance of *Parise la Duchesse* has not been edited since 1860, when it was published by Guessard and Larchey in the series of *Les Anciens Poètes de France*. The poem is preserved in a single manuscript, no 1374 of the Fonds Français at the Bibliothèque Nationale. Numerous verses have become partly illegible over the years, and it has not been possible to recover the readings except with ammonium sulphydrate. As this process restores legibility only for a limited time, it may not be amiss to record readings thus deciphered in Paris a few years ago. These should be of service to the future editor of the poem, although it should be noted that the copyists of 1860 were in general remarkably accurate.

The following pages have been badly blurred 11°, 13v°, 14r°. Incidental verses are affected on folios 1v°, 2r°, 2v°, 3r°, 6r°, 8v°, 9r°, 11v°, 12r°, 12v°. The verses reproduced below record all variations from the Guessard-Larchey edition which occur on the first three manuscript pages just noted. Ammonium sulphydrate has been used on each verse cited in this paper. Line numbers are as in the edition. Suspension points indicate holes in the manuscript. Letters in italics represent obvious readings which, however, were not confirmed even with chemical aid.

Folio 1 recto

Hui mais porrez ouz del riche dux rammont	5
Qui fu dus de sa . . gile et fu ml't gentilz hom	6
Bi . ucaire et taracon et ualence anuirun	8
Li d . prist une femme qui parise auoit nom	9
. not si belle fame de ci quen pre noiron	10

Qui soffri tante poine onques tant nen ot on	13
Herdrez et aloriz et tiebautz dap'ml't	17
Li dux tint vne cort a vne acension	21
Berengieis parla primes se as mis a raison	24
Et selle sapercoit son pere mort auon	31
Ja ne uerroiz ancois passe lacension	38
Nos seront de la terre et per et compeignon	39
Et nos comant dist m' la dame enheroon	40
A san pol de rauane apis unes poison	43
Dun uies masel p' il na peior es mont	44
Ses ont auenimees dedanz mis es poisont	59
Cortoisement lapelle sil la mis a raison	61
Amis parole a moi tu fus fiz au baron	62
Vnes chaucés de paille soliers poinz a (?) on	66
Mais tu ne diras mie que nos ti anuoion	67
Volantiers a non deu li pautroniers respont	68
Dune part prist les pomes qui antoschiees sont	69
Et dautre part la iuste ou estoit la poison	70
Il en unt au palais si monta contre mont	71
La dame ert an la chanbre a deu malaicon	72
Tote sole estoit ni auoit se lei non	73
Et vne chambareire qui anglentine ot non	74
A tant es uos venir I cuuert de garcon	75
La o il uoit la dame si la mise a raison	76

Folio 13 verso (1918-36)

Et ie le uoudrai fort a mon espie boter	1918
Je ferrai beierger dit h' li senes	
Et li traitor ont les enfanz agardez	
H' dit b' uer moi an antandez	
Cla' sont uenu sozdoier adobe	1922
Je ferrai cel premier sor cel escu bande	
Antoine de coloigne lait aler lo destrer	
Et ua ferir antoine le neuou b'	
Desor la bolcle a or li a lescu percie	1926
La blanc aubeic del dos desrot et desmalle	
Tant com aste li dure labati dou destrier	
Puis escrie coloigne ferez i ch'r	
Certes ni gariront li cuuert pautronier	1930
Mar i firent la dame de la terre chacier	
Certes ell a I fil qui ml't fait a proisier	
Nest pas grandres de moi si est bon ch'rs	1933
Huguez de uauenice lait lo cheual aler	
Va ferir b' sor escu lite	
Desor la bocle dor li a frant et casse	1936
Certes ill a I fil qui ml't fait a prosier	1944

Folio 13 verso (1951-75)

Tant ch'r jentils et ocirre et paumer	1951
Et ceuz qui sont cheu les boeuz trainer	
Et foir par ces champs ces desties seiorniez	
Dont li seignor an fuet laiment tiestoine	
A tant ez cla' jentement conrae	1955
Et ses IIII fiz bo ml't tres bien adobez	
Il nen set que les IIII de tant est plus irez	
H' crie cologne franc ch'r ferez	
Certes n'i garnont li cuuert desfae	1959
Mout fu forz la bataille et fiers li chapleiz	
B' et h' remonta et herdrez ses amis	
Duremant sont naure dex lor don encor pis	
Il sont venu tot diout deuant labateiz	1963
Li traitor desrangent set anforcez li criz	
Cla' corrent sore et ses XIII filz	
Par droite uue force es portels les on mis	
An' ses trestorne a escrier ses pris	1967
Por deu ne fuez mie franc ch'r de pris	
Qui or uosdra fuir de tant deu soit il maudiz	
Celle fiere parole les a toz esbaudiz	
A cel poindre qui firent an ont XL ocis	1971
Si em i ont bien XXX que retenus que pris	
La ueissiez estor et fort abateiz	
Ces hiaumes peoier et ses escus crusir	
Et ces oreilles et de si braz despartir	1975

Folio 14 recto

Des traitors ont mort iusqua XX ch'r	1985
Et san moiment batant iusqua XX ch'r prisoners	1986

Folio 14 recto (1991-2011)

De ci a uauuenice ne finent de chacier	1991
Il entrent an la uile puis descendent a pie	
Il se sont desarme et si ont gaaignie	
Blauns haubert et verz hiaumes et bons couranz destriers	
Et si orent conquis L ch'rs	1995
An la chartre parfonde les ont fait trabucher	
Il demanderent laue sasistrent au mengier	
Li parages h' n'i ont rien gaaigne	
An uauuenice furent desconfit et chacie	1999
Lai trouerent le duc desor le pont ou siet	
Delez lui sist sa feme la fille beranger	
A tant ez les traitors poignant toz eslaisiez	
Li dus voit lor escuz et troez et perciez	2003
Et lor aubers trestot rompus et desmailliez	

Et si sont tuit sanglant lor auferant destrier	
Il loi a demande don venez auersier	
Sire del uis deable qui nos out anchauciez	2007
A lla nueue ferte alames astoier	
Cla' le ueillait cuidames fors chacier	
Mais ill i sont venu serianz et escoier	
Par le mien esciant iusqua IIII m'	2011

The remaining isolated verses solved or verified chemically are as follows

A lssue del moutier troua Rai' son sire	141
Dame por deu mon frere beuon si (???)	146
Li traitor lo seguent tuit XII less a les	202
Ml't i est maomez seruiz et honorez	210
Ancor na que deus anz que je sui eschapez	211
Je me uign droit a rome lapost' ai troue	212
Et vos mi corritz sore au le brac acere	293
He las païse dame bien uoi que morez	379
Li mortel traitor sont ml't desmesure	380
Droitement an namor sont lo soir ostele	790
Qui ains de traison ne furent esgare	1188
Je meimes an sui si me uient per ae	1189
Dites moi mon parein que ie man sui ale	1281
De son lignage sont et de lui tinen fiez	1618
Antres qui que as gascoine ne si uout arester	1702
Seignor que aues vos dites por quoi fuiez	1705
I grant presant de pomes li firent apporter	1720
Pormain et dautre chose furent anuenime	1721
San dona son serorje bueuon I bachelier	1722
Et bueues an mania qui ne si sot garder	1723
Il nes reconut mie ce sachez de uerte	1771

EDWARD B. HAM

University of Michigan

GEORGE HERBERT'S *SYCOMORE*

In "The World" Herbert writes -

Then enter'd *Sunne*, and with that Sycomore,
Whose leaves first sheltred man from drought & dew

The inward walls and sommers cleft and tore

By *sycomore*, Herbert obviously means the fig-tree of Genesis, but

how he arrived at this notion has never been explained satisfactorily. G. H. Palmer in his annotation of this line says "The sycamore—perhaps through a false etymology—was often confused with the fig-tree"¹ F. E. Hutchinson, the most recent editor of Herbert, takes over Palmer's note with "considered, by a mistaken etymology, to be a species of fig-tree" The origin and extent of the error is explained by neither editor

The difficulty begins with the Hebrew word שקמה, which appears in I Kings 10·27, בשקמים, I Chron 27 28, והשקמים, Ps 78 47, ושקמותם, Isaiah 9 10, שקמים, and Amos 7 14, שקמים The same word also appears in the Syriac version of Luke 19 14 The Septuagint translators rendered the word as follows Kings, συκαμίνους, Chronicles, συκαμίνων, Psalms, συκαμίνους, Isaiah, συκαμίνους, and Amos, συκαμινα It appears in Erasmus' text of Luke as συκομοραιαν In Buxtorf's Hebrew Lexicon, the word is defined as "Sycomori . . Ficus insitae castaneis, ficus heterogeneae", and in Scapula's Greek lexicon the word is defined as *fig* or *sycamin*, "quod saepius promoro accipitur."

We now know that in the Kings and Psalms' usage the word means *sycamore tree*, for large numbers of these trees grew in the valleys, between Joppa and Egypt,² and that in the other passages it probably meant *wild fig-trees* or *mulberry trees*.³ The word passed from the Semites to the Greeks via the Phoenicians None of this was known, however, to those men who rendered the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Bible into Latin or English in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

If Herbert read a Latin Bible, he found the King's passage rendered *sycomoros* in all but the Juda version, where the word is *moros*. The Chronicles' passage is *ficeta* in the Vulgate and *ficeta campestris* in Castalio's version, but *sycomoros* in the others. The Psalms' passage is *moros* in the Vulgate, but *sycomoros* in all the rest The verse from Isaiah is *sycomoros* in all versions, and the verse from Amos is *sycomoros* in all save Castalio, who has *caprificarius* Luke 19·4 is rendered *arborem sycomorum* by the Vulgate, Pagnini, Erasmus, Juda, and Beza, but Castalio gives *in caprificum*

¹ *The Life and Works of George Herbert* (Boston and New York), II, 226

² Dioscorides, *De materia medica* (Wellman, Berlin, 1906-14), I, 115; Theophrastus, *Opera* (Wimmer, Paris, 1931), p. 59

³ Prosper Alpinus, *De plantis Aegypti* (Venice, 1592), p. 23

and Tremellus in *ficum sylvestrem*. The English versions are variable. The Authorized Version translates every passage as *sycomore*, the Geneva translates all texts as *fig* except the Chronicles' passage, which renders *mulberie*. The Bishop's Bible never translates as *sycomore*, using *fig* in Kings, Amos, and Luke, and *mulberie* in Chronicles, Psalms, and Isaiah.

We should expect Herbert to consult the Authorized Version, the newest and most popular rendering of the Scriptures. If he was struck by the constant use of the word *sycomore* in this translation and compared his texts with a Latin version, he might easily assume that this was the correct rendering of the Greek and Hebrew word. His error would be no greater than that of the learned translators of the King James Bible, and after all, they only err in part.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

The Johns Hopkins University

SHEVCHENKO AND PUSHKIN'S TO THE SLANDERERS OF RUSSIA

Much has been made in various Russian studies of the admiration of Taras Shevchenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet, for the works of Alexander Pushkin. There was indeed the tribute of one great poet to another but Shevchenko's admiration did not extend to all of Pushkin's works and ideas. There was a profound difference of opinion between Shevchenko, who felt himself and his people enslaved by Russia as well as by the tsars, and Pushkin who could not help but thrill to the advance of Russian arms. The Russian poet in 1831 expressed his feelings in the well-known poem *To the Slanderers of Russia*, in which he defied the foes of his country to attack her or even to condemn her because of the suppression of the Polish revolt of that year. In this poem he used the celebrated words, "Shall the Slavonic streams flow into the Russian sea? Or shall it dry up? That is the question." (ll. 13-14). Later on he says "Will not the Russian land arise from Perm to Tavrída, from the cold rocks of Finland to the flaming Kolkhida (Colchis), from the shaken Kremlin to the walls of immovable China, gleaming with a bristle of bayonets?" (ll. 37-42).

As is well known, in his poems from 1843 to his arrest in 1847, Shevchenko was decidedly critical of the Russian state. He expressed it in the preface to his edition of the *Kobzar* which was to appear in 1847 but was prevented by his arrest. At the same time, he was under the influence of the movement for a Slavonic brotherhood as outlined by the Czech poet, Jan Kollar, and as expounded by various other scholars as Pavel Josef Šafařík.

It is interesting that in his first poem on a non-Ukrainian theme, *the Heretic*, Shevchenko treated the burning of Jan Hus at the Council of Constance. In a long introduction to the poem written in 1845, he dedicates it to Šafařík, the author of *Die Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur* and the *Slavonic Antiquities*. It is not without significance that three times in this introduction he employs Pushkin's metaphor but with a strikingly different connotation, for he speaks of the Slavonic sea into which the Slavonic rivers are to run. Thus we read "The Slavonic rivers flowed into one sea" (ll. 54-55) after the reawakening of the Slavs and of their sense of brotherhood. In an apostrophe to Šafařík, he speaks again of "Your new Slavonic sea" (l. 60 ff.) and finally he says. "Glory to you, Šafařík, because you called into one sea the Slavonic rivers" (ll. 69-71). There can be no doubt that in these passages the poet is directly challenging the idea of Pushkin that Russia must be the ultimate home of all the Slavs.

B. H. Khutoretska (*Pushkin i Shevchenko*, in *Velykyi Revolyutsioner*, Odesa, 1939, p. 111) makes a great deal of the similarity of the views of Pushkin and Shevchenko as to the Caucasus and the spirit of the uncivilized people there. It is hardly accurate, for in the Caucasus, Shevchenko fully takes the side of the people of the area who were struggling against Russia and says ironically, "From the Moldavian to the Finn everything is silent in all languages, for . . . it is happy." (ll. 92-94). It is an answer to the proud boasts of Pushkin in *To the Slanderers of Russia*. The whole tone of the Ukrainian poem is strikingly opposed to that of Pushkin's *Prisoner of the Caucasus*, which is a typically Byronic poem and which ends with the definite glorifying of the Russian conquest as a means of putting an end to the disorders in the mountains.

Pushkin's patriotic poem had aroused hostility among some of the Russian liberals and certainly among the Poles. Despite Shevchenko's dislike for the Polish state, his hostility to Russia was far

deeper and he could not resist the temptation to express it, when he had the opportunity to pay tribute to the dreams of a Slavonic brotherhood or to nations struggling for their freedom against Russian attacks, even if Ukraine was not directly involved. The examples here cited may seem small but they deserve more consideration than they have received in determining the relations between the greatest poet of Russia and the greatest poet of Ukraine

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

REVIEWS

The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems ("The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records," Vol VI) Edited by ELLIOTT V K DOBBIE New York Columbia University Press, 1942 Pp clxxx + 220 \$4 50.

This volume puts in the hands of the reader what is in effect a finely edited anthology of OE poetry ranging in date from *ca* 700 to *ca* 1100. The thirty-seven headings, some containing several pieces, e. g., those including the better poems in the Annals and the Charms, offer material of great diversity, reflecting many sides of pre-Conquest cultural life and intellectual activity: echoes from the Heroic Age, the period of Christianization, homely popular beliefs, religious devotion and exhortation, science of sorts, and history, especially that connected with the later Viking period. The gem of the collection is the *Battle of Maldon* with its Viking material handled in what one may perhaps think of as the best manner of the Heroic Lay. The volume also includes the difficult and fascinating *Solomon and Saturn*, recently edited by R. J. Menner with distinguished breadth of vision and range of erudition. The editor was likewise especially fortunate in having at hand Klaeber's summarizing work on the Finnsburgh Fragment, Norman's on the *Waldere*, the late E. V. Gordon's on *Maldon*, Dickins' on the *Rune Poem*, not to mention his own first-rate study of Cædmon's *Hymn* and Bede's *Death Song*. Though these and certain other poems have been considerably studied, many have received less attention, partly because they involve matters outside the scope of ordinary literary history. A most special interest attaches to the one real novelty of the collection, a hitherto unpublished poem on the *Seasons for Fasting* (230 ll.) of which a separate edition by Dr. Flower is

promised. The preparation of the Introduction and Notes obviously involved the digesting and organizing of an exceptionally large and, above all, diverse body of scholarly literature, this has been accomplished with common-sense and discretion. The properly conservative editorial principles established by Krapp for the series is continued. An improvement in the "Contents" pages is the expansion of the matter indexed to include "Introduction, Bibliography, Text, Notes", this convenient feature might well be incorporated without great cost or trouble in any reprint of the earlier volumes, especially of the Exeter Book with its 35 separate headings.

Every reviewer, depending on his particular interests and equipment, will find odds and ends to comment on, details which he may be in a position to correct or sharpen up, there is material aplenty for all Anglists to work on for some time to come, for full interpretation of the past comes only slowly. In this spirit the following scattered points may be noted.

Pp. xx-xxi. the attribution of the Lat. *Waltharius* to Ekkehard I of St. Gall is by no means a sure thing and of late the very century of composition has been challenged by that master of medieval Latinity Karl Strecker (in *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. d. Mittelalters*, iv [1941], 355-81), who would very much like to think of the poem as Carolingian rather than Ottonian. P. xxi, n. 1. the standard edition is surely Strecker's (2d ed., Berlin, 1924—a new ed. in *Mon. Germ. Hist.* is held out as a pleasing prospect), Althoff is chiefly valuable for the Commentary in Vol. II. P. xxi, n. 6. Learned's reprints are published in *PMLA*, vii (1892), 1-208, this not unimportant bibliographical fact may appear somewhere, but I do not find it. P. xxvi. doubts may be entertained as to whether the *Waldere* fragments are bits of a long poem, i. e., of anything that one might properly call an "epic." At any rate, comparison with the *Waltharius* may be quite misleading, since this is very likely much padded in comparison with the OHG vernacular work on which it is surely based. There is, for example, no need to assume that the English poet knew more than the barest essentials about Walther's enfeances, about details of the fateful banquet, perhaps nothing at all of poor Attila's bad hangover, the journey from "Ezelm burc" to the Rhine might, for example, have been covered in a line or two. No such elaborate series of single combats, lengthy debates and challenges, horse-play and jesting after the final fight, are essential to the narrative. After all, cp. the Eddic *Akv.* and *Am.* with *NL*, cantos 20-38, or even better see Heusler on the "Bairwari-sches Burgundenlied" (*Nibelungensage und NL*, 3d ed., Dortmund, 1929, pp. 57-71) for a hint at least of the stage of narrative development and style that the Walter legend may have attained in England vs. the distinctly epical stage of the *Waltharius*. One needs not attribute to the English poet the dramatic tenseness or extreme economy of the Scandinavian poets in order to assume that we may

have the remains of a poem of "lay" length, say of some 300 lines. By and large I have little confidence that the *Waltharius* can give us any very precise idea of the stuff that inspired the English poet or of the substance of his complete work, it is, indeed, all too clear that the *Waltharius* does *not* match the *Waldere* fragments satisfactorily, otherwise such fundamental questions as to who on occasion is the speaker would long since have been answered.

P. xxxiii Brit. Mus Ms. Cott Domit A VIII (F) might better be described as "the Latin-English bilingual of the Chronicle, in some degree related to L, on this same page, n 1, l. 4, read "959 DE, also, slightly abridged, in F (English and Latin)" P. xxxvii, n. 2, first line, read "called Óláfr Sigtrygsson kváian," and last line "to be Óláfr Guðroðarson" P. xxxix, n. 4 cite rather Sigurður Nordal, *Egils s*, etc. (Rvfk, 1933), pp. 130-48, and the Introduction, pp xxxix-lui, for a full survey of the problem of Brúnanburh and Vínheiðr. P. xl, last line, read "3d ed, Oxford, 1914" P. xlviii, l. 7 is there evidence of a "gradual" reduction of the longer to the shorter (younger) rune-series? In fn. 1, ll. 5-7, read "for a short sketch see v. Friesen in Hoops' *Reallexikon* iv, 20-26, more briefly still in *Encycl Brit*, 14th ed, xix, 662, for more up-to-date statements see *idem* in *Runorna* ("Nordisk Kultur," Vol. vi, Sthlm, 1933), pp. 49-68, and Arntz (*op cit*, p clxii, below), pp 97-98, 114-19, 146-52, 207-08, more briefly in *idem*, *Die Runenschrift* (Halle, 1938), pp 84-89. Keller in a. . ."

P. lxi, middle: some mention might properly be made of the Gothic menology fragment P. xc, n 5: does not ON *þórðr* look back rather to *þórfrøðr*, parallel to OE *þurferð*? see H. E. Lind, *Norsk-islanska Dopnamn*, col 1152-56, and Searle under "Thored" and "Thurferth." P. c, l. 24, read "patroness, was abbess of Bede's *Strenæshalc*, etc., formally to be compared with Strensall (YN), though apparently to be identified with Whitby (YN) (ON *Hvítabyr*) (see E. Ekwall, *Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, s vv.)." Passing mention might also appropriately be made of the interesting point that it was under Hild's rule that the epochal synod of 664 (so-called Synod of Whitby) took place at *Strenæshalc*. P. c, n. 3 the story in the *Versus* (ll. 20 ff.), supposedly prefatory to the OS *Hêland*, can scarcely be adduced as a "parallel," inasmuch as the narrative there is almost surely adapted from Bede, see G. Ehrismann, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Lit.*, etc., i, 160. P. cxvii somewhere, perhaps rather in the Notes (pp. 203-04), the gist of Forster's discussion should be given. P. cxiii, n. 4, last line: the statement of the case (in Smith and in Dobbie) is not quite right and should read somewhat as follows "Dragma may be an epithet based on the ON and Icel. adj. *dragmáll* (i. e., *dragmæltur*), "drawing of speech, long-winded." P. cxiv, n. 3, last line, would be clearer if read "of *Æðel-* and *Agel-* (i. e., *Ægel-*) would in this instance reflect the Norman substitution of *Ægel-*

for *Æðel* in OE peis names, see Zachrisson in *Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names*, Pt 1, p. 111, Note (pp 111-12) "Pp. cxxviii-iv the Nine Herbs Charm bustles with difficulties and problems, for whose ultimate solution the services of botanist, folklorist, and student of Germanic religion (for the Odin verses) are likely to be needed. As Dobbie remarks, the charm is for an unspecified malady, it was, indeed, perhaps intended to be panacea, a blanket insurance policy. Suggestive material may be found in J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, xi, 45 ff ("The Magic Flowers of Midsummer Eve"), esp p. 58 ff. on mugwort, also in *Handwörterbuch der deutschen Aberglaubens* under "neuerlei Kräuter." One wonders to what extent if any the Odin passage (ll 32-33) reflects ophiolatry, with which Odin was associated, cp. Hoops' *Reallexikon* under "Schlangenverehrung," and Jan de Vries, *Altgerm. Religionsgesch.* i, 121-22, 227 (§ 173), also 249 (§ 199) for brief comment on the present charm, and most recently Meroney, "The Nine Herbs," *MLN.*, lxx (1944), 157-60.

P. cxxvii, n. 2 Grendon is misquoted, he translates (p. 169) *sigewif* by "victory dames", on p. 216 he comments on the older rendering "valkyries." In view of ON *sig-, þjóð-, -mær* "battle-woman, -maiden, valkyrie," OE *sigewif* might theoretically mean the same and be applied humorously to swarming bees. But it is unlikely that the English thought much in terms of "valkyries," especially considering the fact that OE *walcyrige* itself, apart from glosses, seems to have merely meant "witch." *Sigewif* is probably only a playful epithet—bees victorious in having escaped, swarmed from the hive—and its formation and use here perhaps encouraged by the following *sigað ió eorðan!* "come down to earth, alight!" P. cxxxvii, n. 5, l. 3 cite W. Braune-Karl Helm, *Ahd. Leseb.* (9th ed., Halle, 1928), p. 88, the cited 8th ed. was published in 1921, where the text in question is on p. 85. P. clx the somewhat imposing work on the Brunanburh site by Cockburn, Sheffield lawyer, should, of course, be included, but not without some tip-off as to its essentially comic character (see *Speculum*, viii [1933], 85-87, esp the footnotes). P. clxxviii, l. 3 from bottom, add G. P. Krapp-A. G. Kennedy, *An Anglo-Saxon Reader* (N. Y., 1929), p. 52 (metrical pref. printed as prose); G. T. Flom, *Introductory Old-English Grammar and Reader* (2d ed., Boston, 1930), p. 189 (metrical pref., part only, printed as prose). P. clxx, end, add now "OE Charm A 13. *bútan heardan beáman*," *MLN.*, lxxiii (1943), 33-34.

P. 138, i, 21 (*ætstall*): on this uncertain word add reference to *P.N.M.* (Engl. Place-Name Soc., Vol. xviii, 1942), p. 17, under "Astlam" (earlier Estelham, Astelesham, etc.), standing perhaps for "*hám* by the *ætstall*"; *ætstall* still defies precise interpretation. P. 139, ii, 3: the remark on MHG *vaz* is slightly misleading, since *vaz* only seems to mean "sheath" in the cpd. *swertvaz* (so Koegel

and the dictionaries), Koegel (*loc cit*) is wrong, however, in denying to OE poetry *stán* in the sense "precious stone, jewel". Elsewhere in OE, *stánfæt* renders in appropriate fashion Graeco-Lat. *alabaster* (New Test.) (cp MHG *steinbuhse*). In other OE cpds *stán-* never means "bejewelled," nor do I find such use in MHG, Koegel's examples are all from *steinen*, vb, cp. OE *sténan*, vb also similarly used on occasion. An interesting parallel difficulty presents itself in Ms *staum bort* of *Hildebrandsli.* 65, if this stands by assimilation of *nþ > mþ* (cp *hlumbed* for *hlin-* of *Béow* 3034) for *staun-* (1 e, *stein*) *bort*, on this see Braune-Helm, *op cit.*, p. 196, note *ad loc.* P 141, II, 23a one would like to know more about the somewhat disputed *un mægas*, which, if it is the word or, indeed, a word, would presumably mean "unrelated person" (cp OE *unmæge*, adj.) or perhaps "faithless, treacherous kinsmen" (so Dickins, Norman). The real objection to *mægas* or *unmægas* is, it seems to me, that these do not make good sense in the frame of the Walter legend as we know this (Holthausen evidently felt some such difficulty which he attempts to resolve by his emendation to *mæcgas* "men, warriors"). Without joining the ranks of emenders, I should, however, like to emphasize the difficulty inherent in (un)mægas. If they are "kinsmen," good or bad, who are they? Was Hagen conceived of as a "kinsman" of Walter, a sworn brother? On his return home to Ælfhere's court Walthari of the Latin poem was received with open arms by all and ultimately succeeds peacefully to the throne (see II 1447-50). In any event, for this passage and others an ultra-violet photograph is badly needed.

P. 145, l. 192 the chief, perhaps only argument against *Godrinc* is not so much that this particular cpd. is not elsewhere recorded but that *-rinc* (similarly *-rýne*) does not seem ever to occur as a deuterotherme in OE pers. names (I depend here on the collectanea in H G H Halvorson, *A Study of OE Dithematic Personal Names Deuterothermes*, unpubl. Harvard diss., 1937), though *-rinc* is not rare in common nouns. Pp. 153 ff. the Gothic words cited *passim* are letter-, not rune-names, the Gothic is, by the way, late, somewhat colored by OHG, and perhaps at times corrupt. P. 158, l. 67, at end cite additionally an appropriate ref. to Jan de Vries, *op. cit. supra.* P. 158, l. 70: against an association of OE *heardingas* with ON *Haddingjar* is not merely the context but the form of the OE word (*heard-*), for the OE cognate of ON *haddr*, m. "hair" is *heord*, found in (*b*)undenheord of *Béow*. 3151, cp also OE *heorde*, better *heordan*, f. pl. tant., "hards, hurds" (of flax). P. 159, l. 84. *yre* in *mid ánnre æte yre* of OE *Ann* 1012 EF may be cognate with, or even borrowed from, ON *ýr(r)* "iron, metal" in *kald-ýrr*, -órr, a meaning that does not suit the present context. P. 159, last line: the appearance of the abbreviation (rune) * for OHG *gā-* is commonly thought to reflect English scribal influence; see Braune-Helm,

Ahd Gramm (5th ed., 1936), p. 9, n. 4. P. 198, l. 6 (*scepen*) as I noted in *Engl. Stud.*, LXXIV (1940), 110-11, Malone's discussion of *Henden* (*Widsith* 21) is relevant here. P. 199, l. 1 (*unwunth*) in *loc cit supra* I have pointed out the general unlikelihood of *un* representing a German attempt to represent OE *y*, it is more likely a mechanical miswriting of *un* in the exemplar. P. 209, l. 8 I should not alter Ms *opone*, though *openu*, -o is, of course, historically correct, cp *purhetone* "corroded" of *Béow.* 3049, and almost countless other instances in late OE Mss of confusion in the orthography of inflectional syllables. P. 211, l. 3, 5 (*cweð*) is *cweð* perhaps used incorrectly, "is told, said," as ON *segir* (*frá*)? Finally I call attention to the editor's skilful retrieving of the Ms reading for l. 12b "*ða lǫpu colan*," too modestly hidden in the footnote to the text (p. 121, *ad loc*).

Columbia University has every reason to be proud of the exacting task that Professor Dobbie has so successfully fulfilled, as have all students of Old Germanic culture to be grateful to him.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR

Harvard University

French Syntax List By RICHARD E. CLARK and LAWRENCE POSTON, JR. New York Holt and Co., 1943. Pp. xvi + 271

This work, which was published under the auspices of the Committee of Modern Languages, and is a companion work to Prof Kenniston's *Spanish Syntax List* (Holt and Co., 1937), is described in the Foreword as illustrating "the adaptation of quantitative methods to the discovery of the most useful grammatical phenomena." The authors, in reaction against the "subjective" or "conventional" procedure of most makers of texts in their selection of forms, offer "norms for guidance in selection and arrangement that are based on a readily understandable principle of objectivity"; their own procedure has been to read and analyze sections of 60 modern French works of representative genres, classifying every "grammatical item" according to the Parts of Speech, each subdivision being accompanied by a statistical indication of distribution and frequency.

As the reader looks through this book, and turns over page after page filled with numbered items (of which there seem to be almost 3,000), he may be pardoned for experiencing a mounting feeling of dizziness. Even before he starts his inquiry into the meaning underlying this profusion, his eye will seek for orientation, for indications of some system of co-ordination. He will find for his guidance a decimal system of classification which, unfortunately, is most whimsically observed. For example, 4.95 (agreement of subj.

pron) is, actually, no subdivision of 4.9 (redundant subj. pron.), while 4.9 is, actually, a subdivision of 4.6 (uses of subj. pron.), and 5 (dir and ind obj) of 4 (pers. pron.) In such cases one could almost wish that the authors had simply numbered the paragraphs consecutively up to 3,000, at least such a system would not fruitlessly stimulate the mind to make the effort of co-ordination. Add to this the lack of an index, and the incongruities of allocation which are the result of having chosen a classification based on Parts of Speech—and the reader's desire for orientation is apt to be disappointed.

Nor will he fare better in his search for meaning, and this lack of meaning is due to two basic misconceptions which have determined the presentation of material. The first is the superstition of figures. It could of course happen, in individual cases, that the 'frequency' of a construction is revelatory, but to analyze the language as a whole from this point of view is a meaningless procedure, what can it possibly matter that the pronoun *la* is to be found 1280 times, and *le* 1176? And all too often statistics are used to replace interpretation, as when we are told (p. 106) the indisputable fact that the article is commoner than the Poss with (unmodified) parts of the body (*Corbier releva la tête* vs. *Tu ne t'ennuies pas tes cheveux*). But *when* is the Poss used? Is there a choice according to nuance, or are the two types distinct—as the two examples would (wrongly) imply? 1026 examples of the two 'types' were counted, one could wish they had also been analyzed. It is true that we do find, scattered throughout the text, perfunctory interpretations (a few of which are both new and important) of the single 'items', and, usually, the treatments of the more general syntactical problems (e.g. the omission of def. art.) are preceded by quite sound summaries. But generalities are almost worthless as guides to usage in concrete cases: it is a generally accepted truth that, in the construction *noun + de + noun*, the second noun is subordinated to the first, representing not so much an independent entity B as a quality of A (*maison de campagne*). But in what *ways* is this truth true, to what extent? (may one say *porte de chapelle* 'chapel door'?) Under what circumstances is this construction possible? What are the (manifold!) patterns in which this tendency reveals itself? Any syntactical construction must be studied in the various patterns (each of which is complicated by different factors, and has its own set of associations, its own possibilities of development) in which it appears. And to discern these patterns is the main task of the syntactician.

This brings us to the second point, that of categories. The introductory generalizations are followed by a breakdown of the examples into the most mechanical, formal categories, with all too little regard for their relevancy or necessity. Where the problem itself is largely mechanical (e.g. the article with place-names) the

material is usually over-classified to the familiar "continents, countries, provinces, departments, cities, islands, mountains, rivers, points of the compass" have been added "lakes and ponds, seas and oceans; squares, streets etc., restaurants and cafés, parks, bridges, theatres, operas, churches, schools and other public buildings, other miscellaneous places." Again, why should the antecedents of the rel pron *qui* (subj) be divided according to "person, animal, thing"—or those of *qui* (obj of prep) into proper nouns (*le prince Pepoli chez qui* . . .) and common (*un excellent ami, à qui* . . .)? To know what to reject is necessary for doing real science, the authors are evidently inspired by the belief that detail *per se* is clarification. But if, in describing my neighbor, I state that she has hair growing out of her head, and sometimes stands but more often sits, I have confused rather than clarified my picture (and have managed, somehow, to suggest a monstrosity!)

And this credulous belief in conventional categories becomes, in the case of the really problematic usages, a mental barrier, blocking the way to the discovery of the true categories—i. e. to understanding. Consider the problem offered American students by the 'non-reflexive' use of the Reflexive, the 7,000 examples which could have been studied as a guide to usage were broken down according to trans and intrans., dir and ind obj! And how welcome would be a picture of the Passive, subjected to such competition from *on* and the Reflexive! But the categories here chosen are the 14 tenses and the non-finite forms—which illustrate exactly nothing. Again, just what is the ground covered by the indefinable *on*? The material which might have been arranged to show this has, instead, been classified according to the forms *on* and *l'on* (further subdivided into *et [l']on*, *si [l']on* etc.). But it is the treatment of *noun* + *de* + *noun* which is the most tantalizing throughout the section 'Def. Art,' which is divided according to Classes of Nouns, this construction keeps turning up—but, obviously, in categories where it can never be really treated. It makes no sense to discuss *un goût de fièvre* under Names of Diseases. Finally, however, under 'Indef. Art' [''], the construction is faced squarely out of the (literally) dozens of types which must have been represented by their 2,000 examples, they select one, the 'objective' *manieur d'argent*, the 'subjective' *rire de géant* and all the rest are lumped together under *maison de campagne*—and further subdivided (along with *m.d'a.*) according to whether the second noun is singular or plural. Thus in every case the real problem evaporates; one cannot say important things in unimportant categories.

By basing themselves directly on French literature, by amassing a wealth of material, the result of ten years' labor, the authors had the opportunity of presenting a picture of modern usage which would give the student an insight into the unity and diversity of

the structure that is French. No such picture is given, nor, probably, was it the intention of the authors that one be given. For the principal reason that no living entity emerges from this welter of items lies in an attitude on their part which is proclaimed in the Introduction of this work as its best guaranty: the fear of a "subjective judgment," the fear, that is, of the full-scale operation of the human mind, with its capacity for intuition, for evaluation, for synthesis: the capacity to seek and grasp the significance behind phenomena.

As a matter of fact, this work is evidently offered not as a book but as a pre-book—composed for the benefit of others who will actually write our grammars. But what is this benefit? What can another grammarian do with one example of *Oui, madame* (602 ex) and one example of *tout se perd et tout se retrouve* (154 ex)? He does not need the first, but, as concerns the passive use of the Reflexive, he needs all the other 153—and he must collect them for himself, making his own distinctions. As for guidance in "selection and arrangement of material," the list, given in the Introduction, of current constructions wrongly neglected, is undoubtedly of value. But the bulk of the material represents that upon which all grammarians are apparently agreed; is the text-maker to imitate the over-classification, dividing conditional sentences into 69 sections (two of which illustrate the fact that a speaker may be interrupted before he gets to the apodosis of his sentence)? The pedagogical value of such a procedure is questionable. This is hardly a practical guide, this work undertaken with so practical an aim. Some day, it is to be hoped, a grammar will appear which frankly boasts of being subjective and purposely incomplete.

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

The Johns Hopkins University

Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric. By KARL R. WALLACE. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1943. Pp. xiv + 277. \$5.00.

From Bacon's remarks upon rhetoric in *The Advancement of Learning*, the *De augmentis scientiarum*, and elsewhere, Professor Wallace attempts in this book to construct as fully as possible a systematic treatise on rhetoric such as Bacon might have written had he undertaken that task. Thus nearly three-quarters of the study is devoted to assembling and analyzing Bacon's comments upon the various topics that would be treated in a rhetorical textbook. The author performs this act of synthesis with great thoroughness and scholarly acumen. The most illuminating con-

clusion that emerges is the pre-eminently Aristotelian impress of Bacon's rhetorical precepts—a conclusion deserving even greater emphasis than the author accords to it. For his analysis demonstrates that, although Bacon's ideas on some points have a close affinity with Plato's and on others suggest a debt to Cicero, a systematic rhetoric from Bacon's pen would have resembled no earlier treatise half so closely as that of Aristotle.

The last quarter of the volume, at the cost of some repetition, seeks to relate Bacon's thought to that of the rhetoricians of classical antiquity and of his own day, and to evaluate his positive contribution to rhetorical theory. Here the author forgets that, even though he has systematically arranged Bacon's random comments, the result cannot be treated as if it were a complete and fully considered textbook on rhetoric, and valid inferences drawn from Bacon's relative neglect of some branches of the art. Thus the absence of a discussion of forensic and demonstrative oratory does not justify the assertion (p. 207) that Bacon departs from contemporary opinion in assigning a dominant position to deliberative address. Similarly, Bacon's failure to mention the conventional division of an oration into its principal parts—exordium, narration, proof, and peroration—does not indicate, as Mr. Wallace implies (p. 213), that Bacon would have disregarded them in a textbook and substituted a "functional" treatment of rhetorical disposition. Mr. Wallace, in fact, seems to miss the point of Bacon's comments in *De augmentis*, vi, 2 upon methods of arrangement in discourse. Bacon's aim is to suggest some new and more fruitful bases upon which to divide the principles which may guide the development of a speech, supplementing those already expounded by Ramus and others. Hence his successive divisions, each on a different basis, into magistral or initiative, exoteric or acroamatic, by aphorisms or by methods, assertions with proofs or questions with determinations, and according to the subject matter which is handled. For Bacon's primary concern is to bring rhetoric into line with his program for the advancement of science, and he states explicitly that his remarks are intended to supplement rather than to supersede the teachings of the best rhetoricians. What he has to say on disposition is worth pondering, though his ideas were not developed by later writers. But the evidence does not warrant extolling him as the first to understand what modern theorists term the principle of "functional arrangement."

Mr. Wallace's tendency to overestimate Bacon's divergence from the wiser group of Renaissance rhetoricians who preserved the emphasis upon matter rather than ornament must be allowed for, but if this is done the reader can accept the general conclusions of this careful study. Inaccuracies of detail are rare. One is therefore surprised to find (p. 198) the title of Erasmus' treatise cited as *De copia de rerum verborum*. Also, the characterization (p.

153) of Ascham's style as "watery and flowery" is cause for wonder. Bacon applies these epithets to the style of Osorius, and Mr. Wallace, in a careless moment, must have transferred them to that of Ascham, whom Bacon mentions two sentences later as one who deified Cicero.

The student will be particularly grateful for the 25-page list of works on rhetoric printed in England and on the Continent between 1500 and 1700. It is the most complete list yet published, being considerably fuller than that in W. G. Crane's *Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance*.

FRANCIS R. JOHNSON

Stanford University

Thralldom in Ancient Iceland. By CARL O. WILLIAMS. The University of Chicago Press, 1937. Pp. 169.

It is not altogether unfitting, in the year of Jefferson celebrations, to write a word in appreciation of Professor Williams' book. The time may come—if it is not already at hand—when we shall hail the author of the Bill of Rights as one of the supremely great prophets of a brighter future for mankind, a time when freedom will mean more than not being in prison nationally and individually. The perusal of a treatise of such restricted scope as this one is yet sufficient to bring out in crass relief the fact that until the most recent times the vast majority of human beings has not lived at all, except in a biological sense, that the vaunted achievements of the race in ancient times all reek with the sweat of slave labor. Most humiliating of all, perhaps, is the sorry fact brought out tartly enough by the author that the Church, founded by the One who most ardently insisted on the infinite value and the dignity of the individual, lifted not one finger to ameliorate, let alone abolish, the institution. That was in the early Middle Ages. How about our South in the nineteenth century? The story is not edifying. Still it should be viewed on the background of the institution the world over. However that be, the present work is an excellent corrective to the notion that Old Germanic times were altogether fine and heroic. The saga literature was written by, and from the point of view of, the masters. Here we have the reverse to their obverse, viz., a digest of the many stray observations found in the sagas which help to show how things looked from the point of view of the underdog. Their general consistency testifies to the essential trustworthiness of the literature.

It should not detract from the great value placed upon Professor Williams' work if I point out a few flaws. In the interesting Bibliography I miss such standard works as Munch's and A. Bugge's *Histories*; also M. W. Williams' *Social Life in Scandinavia*.

in the *Middle Ages*. It is somewhat peculiar that no edition of *Vatsdæla saga* was available other than the one by Werlauff, 1812(¹), and that for *Hávarðarsaga*, *Gullþórissaga*, *Kormákkssaga* references are to the cheap and unreliable editions of Asmundarson. I take it as axiomatic that reference should be made, not necessarily to the most recent, but at least to the most accessible and, if possible, best editions.

Regrettably, the Baltic fairy story *Why the Sea is Salt*, related at length (why?), is attributed to Snorri. The translation of *Hóvamól* 37, used as a motto, is entirely misleading. *Skósvæin* is best translated, not as "shoe boy" but as *page*. The *féhrvör* whom Skirnir meets in Jotunheim is of course not the "treasurer" but the *cattle herd* of the giants. *Auð* in *djúpúþqa's* epithet unquestionably means 'deep-minded,' not "sensible."

LEE M. HOLLANDER

University of Texas

The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival By SAMUEL L. SUMBERG
Columbia University Germanic Studies, New Series, No. 12
New York. Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp xii, 234
\$3 00.

Studies in late medieval German pageantic and theatrical history are rather scarce this side of the Atlantic. All the more credit therefore must be given to the author of this investigation, since the book is the first comprehensive and conclusive treatment of this subject. The few treatises available are not only not definitive, but are also apt to suggest false conclusions.

Sumberg's study is basically of a tripartite nature, dealing with literary, folkloristic and iconographic aspects. The Nuremberg *Schembartlaufen* was a shrovetide carnival, performed by the Nuremberg butchers' guild sixty-three times between the years 1449-1539. Well established traditions of pageantry and mumming underlie this carnival. There is the group of clowns and fools who clear the road and play tricks on boys and girls. Then come the heralds in their fantastic dresses, throwing nuts and perfume-filled eggs at the spectators. They are followed by the grotesques and devil-guises, who in their fanciful costumes frighten young and old. The main masquers were the twenty-four to forty-eight *Lauffer*, led by their captains (*burghers*), who were clad in contemporary costumes, embroidered with allegorical and geometrical designs, and who merrily leaped and danced through the streets, accompanied by the jingle of fife and tabor. In their midst they pulled an immense pageant wagon, called *Holle*. The climax of the performance was reached when this tableau (castle, tower, house, ship,

dragon, elephant or bird) was attacked from all sides, stormed, and finally burned by the *Läufer* in front of the City Hall.

Basing his deductions on the study of a prime text (MS Nor K. 444 of the early sixteenth century), the author analyzed the various aspects of this civic festival, the prototypes, history, meaning and names of the dancers and pageants. Of folkloristic interest are the grotesques and monsters, such as the Wild Man, the Wild Woman, the *Altwater*, the Indian, the Pig Demon, the Demon Puppeteer, the *Spiegelmann*, the Knell-ringer etc. The exhaustive chapter on costumes, their symbolism, colors, designs, patterns, paddings, hats, gloves etc is accompanied by sixty miniatures and illustrations, showing the costumes of the dancers as well as the twenty-three different types of *Holle*. No doubt, artist, book-lover, folklorist and germanist must feel thankful to the author for his scholarly analysis and clear presentation of the subject. It forms a solid and well-founded basis for related points of investigation, be it in the field of folklore (*Metzgersprung*, *Moriskentanz*) or literature (*Pramel*). The work is enhanced by a minute description and catalogue of all manuscripts extant which offer an iconographic record of this carnival. A rich bibliography concludes this valuable work.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College

Albrecht von Eyb, Medieval Moralist. By JOSEPH A. HILLER. The Catholic University of America, Studies in German XIII, Washington, D. C. The Cath Univ. of America Press, 1939. Pp. xvi + 220. \$2 50.

In his well-known book *Albrecht von Eyb und die Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus* (Berlin 1893), Max Hermann definitely classifies Albrecht von Eyb (1420-1475) as a German humanist who embraced both the 'Gehalt' and 'Gestalt' of humanism. The works on which this classification is chiefly based are Eyb's *Margarita Poetica* (1472), *Spiegel der Sitten* (1472) and the *Ehebuch* (1471). Hermann's classification has become the *consensus omnium* and found its way into the histories of literature.

Encouraged by some reviewers who seriously questioned Hermann's statements, Hiller here subjects Albrecht von Eyb's works to a close scrutiny. His final deductions contradict Hermann's views in every instance. In contrast to Hermann, Hiller regards *Margarita Poetica* as a compendium of moral instructions, not as a rhetoric, the *Spiegel der Sitten* as an elucidation of good morals, not as a humanistic treatise, and the *Ehebuch* as an instruction on the marriage problem, not as a revolt against medieval ideas, which would regard marriage solely as a matter for civil authorities. Not

satisfied with a mere compromise by declaring that Albrecht, as the hackneyed expression goes, 'steht mit einem Fuss im Mittelalter und mit dem andern schaut er in die Neuzeit,' Hiller considers him a typical medieval phenomenon, a moralist and preacher, who strongly opposed all classically derived rules of conduct and education, so warmly praised and recommended by the true humanists. The author's research is of necessity conducted along philosophical and theological lines. Yet, the philologist will deeply appreciate his contribution to the study of German by his analysis of Albrecht's translations into German. His discussion deals with the following three works: Plautus' *Bachides* ('The Gay Sisters of Athens and Samos' or 'Two Tricks a Day'), Plautus' *Menaechmi*, which through Hans Sachs (*Monechmo*, 1548) and Jacob Ayler ('Comedia von zweyen Bruder auss Syracusa') leads to Shakespeare's 'Comedy of Errors,' and Ugolinus Parmacensis' comedy, *Philogenia*, written in the early fifteenth century in Italy. Of great importance is Hiller's discussion of three hitherto unpublished Latin *opuscula* of Eyb in prose. *Clarissimarum feminarum laudacio* (1459), *Invecta in lenam* (1459), and *An uxor viro sapienti sit ducenda* (1460). In the first *opusculum* he extolled women for their virtue (*pudicitia*), in the second he criticizes them for their vices ('procuress'), in the third he recommends marriage. Albrecht's translation is characterized by extreme reserve in risqué matters rather than by *Ehrfurcht vor dem Urtext*. Thus all vulgar, uncouth, and obscene expressions, which are found so abundantly in these works, are toned down and purified. The word *meretrix*, e. g., is never rendered by *Hure*, but by the gentle *pule*.

It is to be regretted that Hiller's book is not infrequently marred by misprints. Twice whole lines are set out of their proper places. Such mechanical details, however, quite likely to occur when large quantities of a medieval text are continuously interspersed into plain text, can detract little from the intrinsic value of this book. A special and general bibliography comprising some six hundred titles enhances the usefulness of this book.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College

BRIEF MENTION

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES extends its cordial greetings to *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, the first number of which appeared in September. Mr G. A. Klinck and his associates seek to do for Canadian teachers what *The Modern Language Journal* does for teachers in the United States. There will be four numbers a year. Subscriptions of \$1.00 should be sent to Mr P. K. Hambly, 23 Isabella St., Toronto 5.

H. C. L.

A Literary Journey through Wartime Britain. By A. C. WARD. Illustrated by F. T. CHAPMAN. New York Oxford Univ Press, 1943 Pp. vi + 96 \$2 00. For American readers, eagerly hoping for specific information about the damage done to literary shrines all over England, this will be a very disappointing book. Whether because of strict government censorship, or merely because of a lack of opportunity on the part of the author to gather the facts, the descriptions are often worded in the most general terms. For instance, we are told that The Temple Church, the Halls, and the Middle Temple Library have been "severely damaged," that the Westminster Abbey buildings "have sustained heavy damage, some of it irreparable," and that Horace Walpole's house at Strawberry Hill is now "a war casualty." But very little is said about exactly what has been destroyed.

A large portion of the book is given over to pleasant discussions of famous buildings and their literary associations, illustrated by quotations from well known authors. These might have been welcomed in peace time, but only serve to irritate a worried present day reader. We would gladly trade a score of quotations from our favorite authors for some definite word as to which houses have been damaged in the Royal Crescent at Bath, and as to the exact condition of Exeter Cathedral. The author does give some valuable descriptions of London ruins (the photographs are much more revealing than the text), and suggests other changes when he mentions the disappearance of the locked gates and railings inside the many London squares. But when the book is put down the reader is left with scores of unanswered questions. We still eagerly await more detailed word of what the Blitz has done to literary England.

JAMES L. CLIFFORD

Lehigh University

CORRESPONDENCE

VARIORUM SPENSER, MINOR POEMS. In *Modern Language Notes* for May of this year, Vol LIX, pp 336-342, appeared an elaborate but careless review of the *Variorum Spenser, Minor Poems*, Vol I. A rejoinder is always a bore—a bore to read, an even greater bore to write. But this notice of the book is so misleading that, in justice to the editors and their collaborators, both dead and living, a correction is in order.

The review has at least done the volume the honor of minute scrutiny. Each of the 734 pages has apparently been filtered for every omitted period, every misplaced letter or number, every v for u, every missing

variant An indiscriminate list of some forty of these, with hints of others, is made to look rather devastating They assault the mind with mere multitude, like jungle ants, all equal, as if a comma were as important as a variant, a variant as a gloss, and all of equal weight with the integrity of a line of Spenser's verse Hardly can the reader be aware that in all this sediment occurs only one important misprint in the 5200 lines of verse—"and" for "with" in line 86 of the first hymn—and two minor misprints, in the Gloss on the *Calender*, occur two, perhaps three, misprinted words, six misprinted letters, three of them v for u Anyone who has ever struggled with the antinomy between a linotype and an Elizabethan text will not wonder It is some comfort to find that by far most of the noted errors are minute, that they concern less essential parts of the book and do not qualify its usefulness as a variorum edition, however they usurp and offend the microscopic eye

The magisterial, and sometimes invidious, tone of the review would perhaps be less unbecoming if it did not abound in amazing errors and mistakes of its own On two of its pages are nine misreadings or misstatements On page 338 alone there are 17 so-called "corrections" of which seven are wrong. For example, the reviewer asserts that the important variant in the September eclogue, line 257, "is not noted in the Variant Readings." But there it is, in its place, plain as print, on page 703. On one single page the review cites six alleged "misreadings" of the First Quarto of the *Calender*, in every instance the *Variorum* is right, the review is wrong The reviewer seems in doubt about the Quarto's punctuation at *Dedicatory Epistle* 20 8; but she, and Professor Renwick, have only to invert a semicolon to see that it does not become a question-mark. The reading of the Quarto is unmistakable

Such is the review's carelessness in detail But "*paulo majora canamus*" Its more general comment reflects a misconception of the limitations and the functions of a *Variorum* edition, and ignorance of certain practical rules which must govern its editors. It takes particular exception to the omission of certain variants, but does not observe that the *Variorum* records for the *Calender* alone some eighty more variants than even the Oxford edition, the one which hitherto has given most attention to this matter The reviewer does not realize that a point may be reached in the recording of variants beyond which by its very bulk and "minimism" it ceases to be profitable. She asserts that the collation of Quartos Two to Five is "entirely inadequate and also inaccurate," and "that the variant readings cannot be relied upon because they are full of mistakes and misprints," and that "there is a 'general tendency to misrepresent the readings of Q 3.'" All the quartos, however, were carefully collated, and such sweeping condemnation lacks support in the detailed facts, if anyone will take the trouble to examine them, and is discredited by the generally careless haste of the whole review. The importance of the variants to the question of Spenser's archaisms is highly exaggerated, as anyone who has compared the quartos knows; and in any case a sound student of the

matter would never depend merely on recorded variants, but consult the texts themselves

Once the critic asserts the "unintelligibility" of a certain note in the Commentary Most notes taken by themselves are unintelligible Read with the text they concern they are intelligible enough Hard upon this the reader is warned to use this book "with caution and intelligence"

Thus with hinted faults and faint praise and a certain consequential manner this review conveys an impression that *Minor Poems*, Vol I is a well-meant but incompetent performance Against such indirection the book can afford to stand as its own defense

CHARLES G OSGOOD

Princeton University

SOME NOTES ON OTFRID'S *Ad Luitbertum* F P Magoun's text with translation and commentary on Otfrid's preface to his *Liber Evangeliorum* or *Evangelienbuch*, commonly referred to as *Ad Luitbertum*,¹ fills a long-felt want in providing in a form accessible to the English-speaking reader a new analysis as well as a review of previous scholarly treatments of this important medieval critical document The present paper ventures to suggest a few amendments to, and correction of, his translation and commentary

The opening sentence of the *Ad Luitbertum* reads

Dignitatis culmine gratia divina praeclso Luitberto Mogontiacensis urbis archiepiscopo Otfridus, quamvis indignus tamen devotione monachus presbyterque exiguus, aeternae vitae gaudium optat semper in Christo (Magoun, *art cit*, p 872)

This Magoun translated as follows

To the acme of merit, Luitbert, archbishop of Mainz, exalted by divine grace, Otfrid, though undeserving, yet by devotion (to God) a monk and humble priest, wishes the joy of life eternal ever in Christ (Magoun, *ibid*)

Unfortunately this interpretation assumes a reading *culmini* vs *culmine* of the text Since we have an ablative and not a dative to contend with, I suggest that a more faithful and correct translation would run.

To Luitbert, archbishop of Mainz, by means of the height of honor exalted by divine grace, Otfrid, though undeserving, yet by devotion (to God) a monk and humble priest, wishes the joy of life eternal in Christ

This translation corresponds to the proper grammatical construction of *culmine* as an abl of means dependent on the "frozen" participial adjective *praeclso*, rather than as indirect obj of *optat*.

A second and more controversial point is the meaning of *dignitatis* in this same passage Magoun construes it as an abstract noun "merit" I am inclined to view it as a reference to the official dignity of the arch-

¹ "Otfrid's *Ad Luitbertum*," *PMLA*, LVIII (1943), 869-90

bishopric In support of the contention that *dignitatis* has a specific meaning may be quoted the following passage from the *Ad Luibertum* (Magoun, *art cit*, p 888) "*Hunc igitur praesulatus vestrae dignitati sapientiaeque in vobis pari commendare curavi*" This passage clearly indicates Otfrid's association of *dignitas* with the more secular aspects of Luibert's distinction Perhaps both abstract and concrete meanings are suggested by Otfrid's use of the word in his opening sentence, but it seems best not to overlook so likely a specific reference

After discussing his treatment of the opening and closing parts of the four Gospels Otfrid goes on to say

In medio vero, ne graviter forte pro superfluitate verborum ferrent legentes, multa et parabularum Christi et miraculorum eiusque doctrinae, quamvis iam fessus (hoc enim novissime edidi) ob necessitatem tamen praedictam praetermisi invitus, et non iam ordinatim ut caeperam procuravi dictare, sed qualiter meae parvae occurrerunt memoriae (Magoun, *art cit*, p 877.)

Magoun, following Bork, professes to find the passage self-contradictory, probably in the belief that a *cacothyes scribendi* leads to fatigue Yet the old paradox about its being harder to say one's say in one page than in ten may well be applicable here Otfrid seems to have felt the labors of concision and memory to be more of a burden than a comparatively straightforward though more detailed following of a source propped up before him. A further possibility is that Otfrid might have already completed a thoroughly elaborate and complete middle section only to meet with the objections of friends (cp Tasso and Tennyson) that it was too long and then in deference to their wishes set himself to excise a sufficient amount of material to meet their objections.

ALAN J ANSEN

Woodmere, N Y.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

DECEMBER, 1944

Number 8

BAHUVRĪHI IN SEARS-ROEBUCK

Among the many relationships expressed by noun combinations in English, we find that represented by *poster bed*, *gate-leg table*, in which an object is characterized by reference to a distinctive feature a quality, or a constituent or accessory element of composition. The type represented by *poster bed*, where the modifying element is a single noun, goes back without interruption to Old English (*haeft-mece* 'hilt sword'), but the three-member compound is peculiarly modern, and, today, is greatly in evidence

gate-leg table, steel-leg table, flat-top desk, roll-top desk; ladder-back chair, channel-back chair, pillow-back chair, high-back chair, pleated-back chair, box-edge pillow, felt-layer mattress, felt-base rug, high-pile Axminsters, open-toe shoes, stiff-bosom shirt, shawl-collar dress, fly-front dress, kick-pleat skirt, sport-neck blouse, lastex-back girdle, spectator-heel pump, long-pants suit, ear-muff cap, rayon stripe slip, shoulder-strap bag; metal cap jars; T-bone steak; Red-Letter Testament

3-button glove, 2-snap galoshes, 17-jewel watch, 4-motor bomber, twin-engine fighter, single-engine plane, 51-tuft toothbrush, 5-drawer chest, 18-hole golf course, 3-judge court

giant-size bottle, full-size sheets, 50-cent size package, limited-size bedroom, light-weight overcoat, summer-weight worsteds; day-length dresses, ankle-length skirts, full-length portraits, V-shape neck, fast-color housecoat, high-lustre paint, bronze-finish lamp, low-cost meats, low point-value items, high-protein foods, high voltage wires, high-potency capsules, high-speed engines, 260-horsepower engine, long-range bomber, fine-quality tapestries, superb-quality coats.

To judge by these examples we have to do here with a technical or commercial type characteristic mainly of advertising.

As for the explanation of the particular expression *gate-leg table*, it is obvious that this goes back to an original *gate-legged table*;

for centuries the construction with participialized noun has represented the regular pattern for combining nouns with the relationship in question, when the modifying element has been, itself, a compound *blue-eyed girl*, *short-sleeved dress*, *high-heeled shoes*¹ In recent years the suffix has begun to be dropped,² at the present time many expressions represent a state of flux I have seen *2-engined bomber* and *4-engine fighter* in the same (newspaper) paragraph This particular development is much less in evidence in cultured circles (the more distinguished news commentators, for example, are usually careful to say “-engined”), it is rather frequent in journalism (*U-shape building*, *low-ceiling tunnel*), and it is to be found most of all in advertising—particularly, advertising of the routine variety there, “-sized” has practically disappeared, and “-edged” is on its way out, I have even seen *short-sleeve dress*, *wide-brim hat*, *low-price shoes*, *low-heel pumps*.

The majority of the examples above, however, do not go back to an original participialized noun, in many cases, indeed, such a construction would have been absolutely impossible In the first place, the suffix may be used only when the modifier (compound or simple see note 1) represents an integral feature **metal-capped jars* and **glass-trayed coffee table* are hardly possible, since the caps, the trays, are themselves separate, independent objects. Again, it seems to be characteristic of the participialized noun (due to historical reasons which will be considered later) that it can be modified only by an adjective (“*short-sleeved*”) or by a noun with high adjectival value (“*gate-legged* here, the legs are compared to a gate); this would exclude **spectator-heeled*, **sport-necked*, **kick-pleated*, **roll-topped*. And, finally, the suffix is never added if this would give the impression of a verbal participle: **high-piled* [rug], **light-weighted* [coat], nor are we able easily to imagine such formations as **low-costed*, **short-lengthed*, **high-voltaged*.³

¹ In the case of two-member combinations, likewise, the suffix *-ed* offers a variant method of combining nouns one finds *stringed instruments* as well as *string bean* The difference would seem to be that, with the first, the feature is thought of as being more thoroughly integrated into the whole the ‘string’ of a string bean has rather the appearance of an accessory detail than of a constituent element

² It is, of course, seldom pronounced; *gate-leg table* represents a pronunciation spelling

³ **High-potencied* is also difficult to imagine. There seems to be a rather

Until recently the types just listed (as excluded from the participialized construction) could appear only in the form of a prepositional phrase: "a dress *with* a sport-neck," "item of low point value" (or, in the case of *Red-Letter Testament* "a Testament with the words of Christ printed in red") The reluctance against forming a *sport-neck blouse* etc can be attributed mainly to the general tendency, which seems to be on the wane today, to avoid noun combinations of more than two elements, whenever possible⁴ In the last few decades, however, and particularly in the last few years, the preference has been growing, in all categories, for (uninflected) noun combinations, regardless of length, at the expense of prepositional phrases,⁵ and it is with the relationship in question that this preference has made itself most strongly felt—though limited, as we have said, to technical and advertising language. Indeed, at the present moment, the new three-member type⁶ *sport-neck blouse*, *low-cost meats* represent a free pattern of creation, as *poster bed*, the simpler and older type of noun combination, does not

And it is probably due to the creation of those types for which

general tendency to deny the participialized form to an abstract noun unless this has a practical, precise reference thus we find *-sized* and, in our mechanical age, even *-powered*, but not **-potencied*—and surely not **-qualified* (nor, in reference to a person, would we find **-courageed*, **-virtued*)

⁴ This "two's company, three's a crowd" attitude, which has been characteristic of all the categories of noun combinations, would hardly apply to cases like *dining-room rug* (relationship of "place where"), in which the two elements *dining* and *room* have combined to form a unit, *dining room* on the level of *kitchen*. Thus *dining-room rug* is less characteristically modern than is, for example, *high-altitude plane*.

⁵ In some cases we should perhaps go back, not to a prepositional expression, but to a predicate modifier for example, it has been a common practise in advertising to begin by naming the object and to follow this with a reference to its properties: "percale sheets excellent quality"; "lounge chair pillow back, dull-finish" Thus the way is prepared for *excellent quality sheets*, *pillow back chair*—and even *pillow-back, dull-finish chair* (We find this same reverse word-order with adjectival modifiers: "an *open-to-the waist neckline*," "the *below-the-waist jacket length*")

⁶ Indeed, in not a few cases, we find combinations of four elements. *extension leaf top tables*, *low point-value items*, this was, perhaps, only to be expected, once the barriers were let down. It would seem, however, that four represents the limit—that is, outside of headlines (*Air-Raid Sector Fund Drive*), and official titles (*7-week Red Cross part-time course*).

the construction with *-ed* would have been impossible, that the suffix is beginning to disappear from expressions in which it originally figured: a *spectator heel pump* would lead to a *low-heel pump*, a *low-cost item* to a *low-price item*, a *roll-top desk* to a *flat-top desk*.⁷ As a result of both these developments, we have a general type, which never before existed, more elastic of form and of reference (the distinguishing feature may be integral or accessory). It is, obviously, well-suited to commercial purposes, in addition to its wider range, this type has a brisk, dynamic appeal⁸—often, a blatant quality—which is peculiarly appropriate for advertising *open-toe shoe* (compare the brand-name *Safety-Toe Shoes*) has a suggestion of the “trade-mark” which was lacking with the more dignified participial type.

And much the same flavor is present in the few cases when this pattern is applied to a human being; in the following examples it is again a question of officially recognized types and brands which must be labelled *teen-age girl*,⁹ *white-collar worker*, *medium-income group*, *3-star general*, *gumshoe detective*, *strong-arm guy*, *cold-nose boys*. This procedure is one which betrays a lack of respect for the privacy and the dignity of the human individual by the

⁷ Theoretically, the development could have been the opposite: first the suffix is sloughed off and then, due to the appearance of a *flat-top desk* (or, to take a less plebeian example *gate-leg table*, which is sanctioned by Webster), the way would be opened to formations for which the suffix had never been possible. But this seems to me unlikely: to what influence could we attribute the development *flat topped desk* > *flat-top desk*, in the absence of a *roll top desk*? Surely a phonetic explanation is not adequate, if it were, we could, perhaps, expect to find a **lace-trim dress* (where a genuine participle would be in question). And I have found no signs of such a development.

The most conclusive proof, however, is seen in the comparatively early appearance of the type *roll-top desk*: this particular expression is attested as early as 1890—long before a *flat top desk* dared make its appearance in print.

⁸ An appeal which is due to its lack of inflection. In *open-toed shoe*, the *-ed* manages to suggest the formative or creative activity involved, and presents us with a carefully finished product, but *open toe shoe* asks us to make this association between the detail and the whole, ourselves: we must assemble the object in our own minds, as it were.

⁹ *Teen-age girl*, like *junior miss*, comes from the language of advertising—though now it may also be found outside that sphere (e. g. in a sociological reference).

easy coinage of a label, a distinguished officer can be dismissed as a *3-star general*, and we have a trade-mark instead of a man.

As far as logical relationships are concerned, we could also include here the expression *barefoot boy*. But, with this half-poetic expression ("blessings on thee, little man") we sense immediately a difference of atmosphere. And indeed *barefoot boy* is attested, long before the day of *white-collar worker*, in the year 1000, it has a history which reaches far back into Indo-European, and is our one tie with a tradition by which the goddess of the dawn could be called "Rosy-Finger Eos." This is the literal translation of the Greek *ῥοδοδάκτυλος*, *barefoot* was the equivalent of the Latin *nudipes*, in all cases we have to do with the construction known as Bahuvrīhi. Now, in those languages where (with the exception of apposition) the combination of uninflected nouns was practically impossible, the appearance of such examples as *puer nudipes* 'a boy with bare feet,' *ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἥως* 'Eos of the rosy fingers,' represented a real problem, it was obvious that this construction could not have been intended originally to express the relationship "the person is characterized by a certain feature"—a relationship which theoretically, at least, presents no problem for English.

One explanation of this type has been to treat *barefoot*, for example, as representing originally, not a compound noun in which *bare* modifies *foot*, but as a phrase 'bare of foot,' in which *bare* would modify the person.¹⁰ A much more satisfactory explanation is that given by Petersen, "Der Ursprung der Exozentrika," *Indo-germanische Forschungen*, xxxiv, 254-85, who believes that the original meaning of *barefoot* was, quite simply, "bare foot;" in order to explain the construction represented by *barefoot boy* he begins with a general consideration of the use of metonymy in the coinage of nicknames and epithets. By means of examples chosen from various languages and periods he illustrates the tendency to

¹⁰ Cf Brugmann, *Kurze vergl Gramm* p 303—Evidence in support of this interpretation for Old English has been offered by Eduard Schön ("Die Bildung des Adjektivs im Altenglischen," *Kieler Studien zur eng Phil* [1905] II, 27), who points to the type of compound represented by *brægenseoc* ('brain sick') which can, of course, be interpreted as 'sick of brain' The fact that the word order in e.g. *ferhð-frec* ('spirit-bold,' 'bold of spirit') is exactly the opposite of that in *collen-ferhð* ('a bold spirit') he dismisses as of no consequence

identify a person with some one distinctive feature of his appearance or personality, and to apply to him a proper name descriptive of this feature—which may involve even his characteristic deeds and remarks, in English, for example, we find such names as “Miss Fixit,” “Johnny Zero” (and we may compare the name given the English by the French “les Goddams”) The pattern most frequently occurring, however, was a combination of adjective and noun, designating some bodily part, spiritual trait, object of clothing, and which was made to serve as the nickname of an individual (cf. Eng. *Bluebeard*), later we also find general epithets (cf. Eng. *a greybeard*). Today, the connotation of such compounds is apt to be pejorative (*fathead, dimwit, brass hat, bluestocking, highbrow, longhair*), but all the examples I have seen from the earlier language would indicate that this type of epithet represented a title of honor in Old English such expressions as “bold-spirit” (*collen-ferhð*), “strong-spirit” (*swið-ferhð*), “stout-heart” (*stearc-heort*) were very frequent, and “grey-hairs” (*gamol-feax*) was used of King Hrothgar himself The same noble tone seems to have been preserved when this construction was applied to inanimate objects: in *Beowulf* this “title” is found only in reference to ships and weapons. “foamy-neck” (*famag-heals*), “hard-edge” (*heard-ecg*): cf. “Old Ironsides.”

This type, in which the metonymic compound was used independently, as a name, represents the starting point of our development. But it was a simple step, involving originally no change of emphasis, to juxtapose such a compound to a second name, proper or common, designating the person (cf. Eng. *Robin Redbreast; a greybeard wretch*. Keats)—and it is this which would explain the origin of our *πόδοδάκτυλος ἦώς*, barefoot boy. Originally, then, such expressions represented simply a case of apposition (a type of noun combination quite regular in Indo-European): just as *greybeard wretch* = “a wretch who is a greybeard,” so *barefoot boy* = “a boy who is a barefoot.” But, due to this juxtaposition a shift of emphasis developed: once this type of compound, in which the part is taken for the whole, is brought into connection with the “whole,” then the latter tends to dominate the former: the force of the metonymy is threatened, and the original, limited reference is allowed to re-assert itself: in *barefoot boy*, *barefoot* is no longer a

person, but a foot.¹¹ And, as the use of the appositional construction increased, this interpretation (which is the only one possible today for *barefoot boy*) came to be the regularly accepted one.¹² This meant that combinations of the general type *ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως*, *barefoot boy*, could be formed directly with the meaning "B is characterized by A"—without passing through the stages of metonymy and apposition. Now this development, whereby the compound is subordinated to the second noun, means that the former comes to assume the status of an adjective, and, as a result, adjectival endings gradually develop. In Greek we find *ποδώκης*, -ες,¹³ in Latin *longimanus*, -a, -um, in Old English *blonden-feax-e*.

¹¹ Similarly, it would be possible to interpret *greybeard wretch* as a 'wretch who has a grey beard'. This would, however, be absolutely impossible in cases where the metonymic compound has already taken on a specialized meaning transcending the original reference. *bluestocking wife* could never be interpreted as a 'wife wearing blue stockings'—for a 'bluestocking' herself is no longer one who wears blue stockings.

And it is important to note that it is *only* this type of apposition which is apt to be met with today (Keats' *greybeard wretch* is plainly a poetic licence) that is, a type which precludes the loss of the original metonymic element (cf. also *redcoat scoundrel*, *leatherneck sergeant*). Thus modern English, where the most primitive stage of Bahuvrīhi is fairly common (*a greybeard*), refuses to go beyond the threshold of the second stage and to repeat the development which this construction underwent centuries ago: we may say "he is a half wit" but hardly "a *half-wit pupil" (That this development could take place so easily with *ῥοδοδάκτυλος* is due to the comparative lack of distinction in Indo-European between noun and adjective: a descriptive noun was immediately capable of being used as a modifier, in the Lat. *exercitus victor*, for example, we could say that the noun *victor* is "used adjectivally" and means only 'victorious,' but originally this type represented apposition ['an army which is a victor'])

¹² There can, of course, be transitional stages between *greybeard wretch* and *barefoot boy* in Old English, where the types *greybeard* and *greybeard wretch* alternate rather easily, it is difficult to be sure of the emphasis intended in such an expression, for example, as *rum-heort cuning*. This might mean 'a king who is a large-heart' (which is the manner of interpretation preferable for *greybeard wretch*) cf. *steorc heort* used as a noun. 'a stout-heart'. On the other hand, the very ease with which such apposition was effected in Old English (in contrast to the rarity today of *greybeard wretch*) would suggest that the development was already on its way to the stage represented by *barefoot boy* 'a king who has a large heart, a large-hearted king.'

¹³ Cf. also *διδύμους*, where the order is the reverse. A preliminary to this development in Greek was a shift of reference, whereby the adjective was

So far, in our consideration of Bahuvrīhi, the first element has always been a compound. And, indeed, it seems to be the case that only with compounds may we find the development by which a metonymic name takes on an adjectival function in the meaning 'characterized by. . .' That compounds would be found more frequently in Bahuvrīhi is obvious in most cases reference to an unqualified feature would not be sufficiently distinctive to serve as a name, either of an individual or a class it is doubtful if anyone was ever called "Hair," "Sword," "Heart."¹⁴ Thus, for such simple nouns, the very first stage of the development in question would be impossible.¹⁵

This does not mean, however, that we will not find in Indo-European, single nouns of adjectival function and suffix used in this meaning this is exactly the meaning of such terms as *togatus*, *occulatus*, *caudatus*, *conchatus*, *stellatus* in Latin. But here we have to do with a construction quite distinct from Bahuvrīhi, with such words the adjectival function and the adjectival suffix existed from the earliest stage of combination, nor was there ever a question of

felt to refer, not to the part (= "[possessed of] a nimble foot') but to the person—who is 'nimble with his feet,' 'nimble of foot', thus 'nimble of foot' would be, according to Peterson, not the original meaning, as most grammarians had believed, but a secondary development (Incidentally, it was for reference to this stage, where 'mutation' is involved, that the term *Bahuvrīhi* was coined.)

¹⁴ One may find a single noun used as a name—with which a qualification is taken for granted Peterson mentions such proper names as Eng *Foot*e, Germ *Nase*, which must have represented original nicknames, and which could have designated only someone with a *big* nose, *big* feet Since the quality implied ("muchness") is simply that of "nose-ness" etc, reference to the quality could be omitted But it is nonetheless implied no one was ever called "Nose" simply because he had a nose (as he might be called "Warts" for a similar reason see below, note 15)

¹⁵ There are, of course, certain features, less commonly shared by mankind, which would be quite distinctive enough to enable us to identify the person therewith viz a tumor, a wart, a monocle. But, though such terms could serve easily enough as proper names ("The Monocle," "Warts"), they could not, unlike the compounds *brass hat* etc, ever be used to designate a class one could never refer to a person as "*a* monocle," "*a* wart" Thus such names could never be used in apposition with a common noun ("*a* monocle man, *a* wart man"), and in this way they would be denied the second stage of development, by which they might come to serve as adjectives in the meaning 'characterized by,' and finally take on adjectival endings.

"identification of part with whole," or any of the other features of Bahuvrīhi. Thus we find two constructions, quite distinct in origin, by which the relationship 'characterized by . .' could be expressed. This second type, represented by nouns with participial endings, was also to be found in Old English "walled," "ringed," "landed," "bearded" belong to the early language.¹⁶ And here a blend took place which was unknown to the older languages. the *-ed* of *bierded* was transferred to the Bahuvrīhi compounds, as the latter developed the adjectival emphasis, and we find *sid-feax-ode* 'long-hair-ed' alternating with *sid-feax* 'long-hair' (and with *sid-feax-e* 'long-hair-y'). And it was this hybrid construction which was ultimately to replace the original form of Bahuvrīhi for centuries the type *barefoot boy* has been practically extinct, with *bare-limbed boy*¹⁷ reigning supreme.

The disappearance, in the Middle English period, of *barefoot boy* is not difficult to understand as the effects of the Norman Conquest made themselves felt in the English language, the French influence, unfavorable to noun combinations in general, would tend, particularly, to discourage these three-member combinations. I was not able to find a single example of the type *barefoot boy* in the first half of the *Canterbury Tales*. But the decline of the Bahuvrīhi type did not, in itself, guarantee the survival and growth of the participial variant *bare-limbed boy*; for it would surely seem that the same tendencies which led to the decline of the once-flourishing *barefoot boy* would also work against *bare-limbed boy*—which is equally a three-member sequence; how, then, was the language able to retain it? If we examine the following passages from Chaucer (representing all the examples of the type *bare-limbed* which I happened to find with him) an interesting solution presents itself:

He was *short-sholdred*, brood, a thikke knarre (*Prol.* 549)
Gat-tothed was she, soothly for to seye (*Prol.* 430)
Gat-tothed I was, and that bicam me weel. (*W. of B.* 603)

¹⁶ In addition to the type 'walled town' etc., Old English, as we know, was also able to express the relationship 'characterized by' without inflection. 'hilt sword.' It is possible to find both constructions used in exactly the same reference in *Beowulf* both 'ring-prow' and 'ringed-prow' are used of a ship. This double possibility of course facilitated the development of 'long-hair man' into 'long-haired man.'

¹⁷ As for the particular expression *bare footed*, this is not attested before 1530.

Somme seyden thus, somme seyde it shal be so,
 Somme helden with him with the blake berd,
 Somme with the balled, somme with the *thikke-herd* (Kn T 1660)
 Agayns this *roten herted sinne* of Accidie and Slouthe
(Per T 689)
 When the firmament is clere and *thikke-sterred* (Astr II, 23)
 Than are they folk that han most God in awe,
 And *strengest feythed* been (Tr and Or 1007)

In every case but one (*roten-herthed sinne*) the compound adjective is used predicatively, or as a noun. Thus it would seem safe to assume that, due to French influence, the use of the three-member sequence *bare-limbed boy* was discouraged, but the adjective *bare-limbed* itself was preserved—ready to enter again into combination with a noun when conditions were more favorable. Just when this began to take place I do not know, but in Shakespeare the type *bare-limbed boy* flourishes in great profusion: the poem *Venus and Adonis* opens with the stanza.

Even as the sun with *purple-colour'd face*
 Had ta'en his last leave of the weeping morn,
Rose cheek'd Adonis hied him to the chase,
 Hunting he lov'd, but love he laugh'd to scorn
Sick-thoughted Venus makes amain unto him,
 And like a *bold-fac'd suitor* gins to woo him

And in this same poem we find: *flint-hearted boy*, *pale-fac'd coward*, *shrill-tongu'd tapsters*, *black-fac'd Night*, *flap-mouth'd mourner*, *hard-favour'd tyrant*, *Iust-breathed Tarquim*, *close-tongu'd Treason*, *black-fac'd cloud*, *fleet-winged duty*, *sour-fac'd groom*, *hard-favor'd groom*, *bare-bon'd death*, *salt-wav'd ocean*, *long-experienc'd wit*, *strong-tempered steel*, *blue-veined violets*, *ruby-colour'd portal*, *strong-necked steed*, *well-breath'd horse*.

It seems quite likely that it was the influence of the classical Renaissance which gave especial encouragement to this type: to the poets of this period, delighting in vivid imagery, must have appealed the richness and compactness of the descriptive device of Bahuvrihi which they found in classical authors—and which they could imitate so well in their own language, thanks to the preservation of the compound adjectives in *-ed*. And, since that time, the particularized variant has become a common feature of our every-day language; the literary, poetic pattern represented by *fleet-winged*

*duty*¹⁸ became trivialized and commercialized, to give us *short-sleeved dress*, *high-heeled shoes* etc.

But the story, as we have seen, does not end here. Today we are witnessing a rebirth of the Bahuvrīhi type in *short-sleeve dress*, *high-potency vitamins*, *white-collar worker*¹⁹. The resemblance is, of course, a matter of form alone, here there is no question of any development from a metonymic noun used in apposition, this 'pseudo-Bahuvrīhi,' from the moment of its appearance, possessed the meaning 'characterized by. . .' Moreover, the original was created as a designation of *persons* (divine, heroic persons), and when this title was applied to things, as in Old English, it bore a suggestion of personification and continued the same noble, poetic

¹⁸ Here, as well as in *black-fac'd Night*, *close-tongu'd Treason*, *bare-bon'd death*, *salt-wav'd ocean*, *blue-veined violets*, the participialized construction serves in the formation of *epitheta ornantia*.

¹⁹ It is, of course, the second stage which is represented by *short-sleeve [dress]*, the first stage, as illustrated by *flatfoot*, *baldhead* has always been with us (though the connotation has changed drastically), but has never, since Old English times, repeated the development of a *barefoot* > *barefoot boy* > 'a boy with bare feet'.

If it be desired to use the epithet as an adjective, then we must have recourse to the participialized form *a baldheaded man*. There is, however, little possibility of alternation between the types *a baldhead* and *a bald-headed man*, with the case in question, the noun *baldhead* has become rare (we know it mainly from the Bible story of Elijah "Go up, thou baldhead!"), and *baldheaded man* has simply taken its place. Moreover, it must be noted that most of the Bahuvrīhi nouns today are used in a figurative reference—which would be immediately lost if the epithet were cast in participialized form: *a flat-footed boy*, *a high-browed person* could have only a literal reference, with no suggestion of a 'policeman' or of an 'intellectual snob'.

And, obviously, **high-browed music*, **high-browed traditions* would be impossible, since in this case it is the noun, not the adjective, *highbrow* that is in question (music of highbrows, for highbrows, by highbrows). I have found, however, just such an impossible creation in the statement attributed to Mr. Max Goberman, the orchestra conductor (*Baltimore Sun*, Jan. 25, 1944), who declared that he had no patience with "long-haired, namby-pamby traditions". His remarks were in reference to the recent quarrel between the boogie-woogie artists and the classical musicians, known to the hep cats as the "long-hairs", in the retorts of the swing enthusiasts there were several references to "long-hair music"—which is, of course, the correct form. Mr. Goberman, while endorsing this lowbrow metaphor, unfortunately tried to refine its form—a procedure which, in general, is not to be recommended.

connotations But today it is for reference to inanimate objects that this "new" type is especially designed, and it springs from the non-poetic soil of the technical, the commercial, the official Thus, when we occasionally find this construction applied to persons, the suggestion of a trade-mark is still in evidence Whereas once a sword, a ship, was given an epithet fit for a hero or a goddess, today a warrior is labelled in the manner of a manufactured product *3-button glove* > *3-star general*.

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

The Johns Hopkins University

JAUFRE RUDEL, CASELLA AND SPITZER

In a long study,¹ largely based on the work of the Italian scholar, Mario Casella,² Professor Leo Spitzer attempts to refute a short article which had advanced the suggestion that Jaufré Rudel's distant love may have been a personification or figurative representation of his love for the Holy Land.³ S. believes instead that the poet's love is:

la manifestation la plus émouvante de ce que j'appelais le 'paradoxe amoureux' qui est à la base de toute la poésie troubadoursque amour qui ne veut posséder, mais jouir de cet état de non-possession, amour-*Minne* contenant aussi bien le désir sensuel de 'toucher' à la femme vraiment

¹ "L'Amour lo[i]ntain de Jaufré Rudel et le sens de la poésie des troubadours," *Univ. of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literature* V, 1944 Pp. 74 Misprints in this pamphlet are too numerous to list.

² See *Archivio storico italiano*, II, 1938, 3-63, 153-199 S repeatedly cites this work which contains similar attacks on the historical methods of scholars from Diez to Jeanroy, similar citations from the Church Fathers, and a similar interpretation of Rudel's poems. To many, Casella, by recreating in his own words the poems of Guillaume IX and Jaufré Rudel, poems which some of us would prefer to read in the original, will seem to have shed darkness rather than light. This is especially true in the case of Guillaume IX whose essentially human qualities evaporate in the miasma of generalizations based on the Church Fathers On the actual views of medieval churchmen regarding physical and romantic love, see C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love*, 14 ff.

³ Grace Frank, "The Distant Love of Jaufré Rudel," *MLN*, LVII, 1942, 528-534.

'femme' que le chaste éloignement, amour chrétien transposé sur le plan séculier, qui veut 'have and have not' (1-2)

Between these two hypotheses others must give the final decision

The attempted refutation, however, is linked in the author's mind with the greater problem of the proper approach to medieval literature, and of this I may perhaps be permitted to speak. S rightly regards an understanding of the religious and spiritual conceptions of the Middle Ages as a necessary prelude to the interpretation of its literature. Most scholars have always assumed this to be true. But at the same time S rejects as useless an understanding of the historical background, social conditions and documentary evidence of the period. In justification of his point of view, S interprets in metaphysical or purely esthetic terms, with a remarkable display of ornamental exegesis, poems usually considered essentially simple, tender, graceful and delicate. Whether, by interposing between Rudel and his readers a *rayonnement métaphysique* and a wealth of erudition including citation of the Pythagoreans, St Augustine, Goethe, Wagner and Nietzsche, S. has truly interpreted the simplicity and exquisite melody of a poet described by his ancient Provençal biographer as writing *vers ab bons sons, ab paubres mots*, each must judge for himself.

Instead of seeking to appreciate the distinguishing characteristics of the various troubadours and the differences in their individual poems, S., like Casella, groups them all together (note the words *toute la poésie troubadouresque* above) and reduces them to critical formulae, to "systems" and to "cycles." He refuses to regard as possible a figurative representation of the Holy Land in terms of a human passion because according to his rigid conceptions such a representation would constitute Allegory and Allegory has definite rules (2, 30 ff.)⁴ Moreover, for him, such a poem would be a *chanson de croisade* and this is a *genre* with a tyrannical pattern (35). S. insists on grouping poem VI with Rudel's poems II, III and V because it fits into his "cycle" (8, 21 ff.) This "fit" is assured by the citation of lines 7-10, 25-27 in sequence with no

⁴ One is tempted to ask whether the supreme allegory of the Middle Ages, the liturgy of the church, obeys these rules. However, it should be stressed here that, although S constantly plays on the term, the word "allegory" does not occur in the article he attacks, nor was the rigid formalism of any *genre* in its author's mind.

warning of the omissions before, between and after the citation (22) Gaston Paris, Jeanroy and Hoepffner all recognized the disparity in tone between this poem and the others it is a light, jesting *jeu d'esprit* of a type well known from other works and each stanza ends with a jolly "a, a" But because the idea of distance occurs here and in poem III, as well as in the others, they must all perforce belong to the same "system" (21 ff, 28-29). Now, no one, beginning with the ancient biographer, has ever failed to remark a certain meagreness in Rudel's vocabulary, and we hardly need a reference to S's stylistic studies (24) to make us aware of the repetition of certain words and phrases in our poet Nor is there any reason for assuming that Rudel might not avail himself of similar language in referring to different ideas. Rudel was a poet, not a codifying critic.⁵

Somewhat naively and pedantically S. lectures his readers on universally recognized facts he tells them that many artists have treated the same theme both lightly and seriously (citing Shakespeare, Lope, Corneille, Kleist and Claudel, Haydn, Schumann, Brahms and Ravel [22]), that the nature-beginnings of the troubadours are usually consonant with the mood of their poems, that repetitions of similar words and phrases serve those who would analyze a poet's style, etc. These observations, however, in no way controvert, but actually support the thesis that in two of Rudel's poems he may have symbolized his longing to go to the Holy Land in terms of a human passion.

The possible historical interest of the *Envoy* of poem II completely escapes S: largely because the poem was destined for a crusader, Hugh de Lusignan, because it mentioned provinces espous-

⁵ On pp. 24, 28-29 and elsewhere, S. suggests that I failed to include a consideration of poems III and VI because they did not fit into my system. But I envisaged no "system" I clearly stated, 532, n. 10, that three of Rudel's poems, III, IV, and VI, seemed to me to have no connection with the Holy Land, and as I was concerned with showing that II and V, hitherto not associated with it, had such a connection, I did not discuss the others in detail. But curiously enough, S., who *has* a system and who in his long polemic comments *in extenso* on all the other poems, gives scant space to the one poem, I, which even he admits to be a "chanson de croisade authentique" (4), nor does he devote much more attention to poem IV which cannot be twisted into a metaphysical mold by any effort of the imagination and which is treated only in a footnote (71, n. 41) where it is interpreted (the biographical approach?) as depending upon "une anecdote personnelle."

ing the Second Crusade, because Rudel wrote another poem similar in tone to this one and universally associated (even by S) with the crusade, because we know that the poet really went to the Holy Land, and because the rest of the poem accords with such an interpretation, did it seem possible that the whole work had its genesis in the poet's enthusiasm for a cause obviously dear to him S, who prefers to interpret the poets of the Middle Ages in the light of generalizations derived from St. Augustine (354-430) rather than from contemporary documents, seems to know little of the spiritual exaltation and mystical devotion of those who preached the crusades and of those who thought to gain everlasting life in Paradise by taking part in them. At any rate he considers that by connecting Rudel's *Lanquan li jorn son lonc en may* with the crusades we somehow lose one of the jewels of Provençal poetry and make of it "une œuvre fadelement ingénieuse, sans relief ni distinction" (39). This of course would be no reason for rejecting a hypothesis we considered valid, but is the premise established? Is the religious fervor that finds expression in a longing to reconquer the land where Jesus suffered martyrdom a theme necessarily less beautiful or spiritual than that of a human love which seeks "to have *and* have not"?

The difficulty with a purely metaphysical or esthetic approach to medieval literature is that its purple patches and subjective generalizations so frequently misrepresent or distort the original. What is left of the essence of Jaufré Rudel's graceful verses after they have been filtered through the alien personalities and elaborate learning of S and Casella? Moreover, this kind of interpretation, substituting one type of "source" for another, overlooks the human element in all art. Our troubadours were men as well as poets and musicians, men whose attitude toward life, love and their professional pursuits varied as much as that of their modern followers. To assume that the ideas of a fourth or fifth century mystic pervaded the poetry of each and every troubadour leads to such absurd conclusions as Casella's when he interprets in Augustinian terms poems so bawdy and physically explicit that chaste modern editors refrain from translating them. The differences between Marcabrun and Bernard de Ventadorn, between Guillaume IX and Jaufré Rudel,

between Cercamon and Arnaut Daniel, between Bertran de Born and Giraut de Bornelh should make one hesitate to accept any formula "qui est à la base de toute la poésie troubadouresque." Even the word *joy*, so frequently used by the troubadours, which S. and Casella equate with the *gaudium* of the mystics, takes on different shades of meaning in the works of these various poets. Here and elsewhere, the aprioristic approach of S. and Casella gives us something too inflexible to be valid for such diverse authors.

Certainly one must understand medieval philosophy before trying to interpret medieval literature. Certainly one must seek to apprehend the essence of a poem before discussing external factors that may have accounted for it. But there are times when these alone are not enough, and it hardly seems fair to assume that those who find enlightenment in historical researches (and who in discussing them have not the time, space or desire to recreate in their own prose poems more beautifully fashioned by the men who originally wrote them) necessarily refuse *de voir la substance de cette poésie* (3), do not read the works they study *du commencement à la fin* (13) and do not make a *tour de l'œuvre en soi* before investigating it (45, n. 1). Possibly they recognize the fact that a generalization or synthesis is only as valid as the truth of its component parts; possibly they believe that a scientific journal is not the best medium for impressionistic criticism, possibly they, like Paul Hazard, know and exercise in its proper place "l'art délicat de disséquer sans tuer, d'effeuiller les pétales sans faire évanouir la nuance ou le parfum."⁶

True, there are great works of art which give esthetic satisfaction irrespective of their historical background, but *all* do not, and many even by poets of the highest rank, not to mention those by inferior writers, may gain immensely from a consciousness of what brought them into being. To take only a single instance, François Villon was not only a superb poet but also a thief, exile, murderer and condemned criminal: no one can adequately appreciate verses that range from mannered eulogies to paeons of uninhibited emotion, from class-conscious cynicism to lyrical evocations of beauty, faith and penitence, without knowing something of the poet's life and times.

⁶ H. Peyre, *French Review*, xvii, 1944, 312.

Nor is the average man so constituted that he willingly restricts his knowledge of literature to its esthetic or metaphysical values. We read for intellectual as well as emotional satisfaction, to learn about mankind and the world in which we live as well as to feel and enjoy. Most of us are interested in literature not only as an art, but as an interpretation of life. Accordingly we believe that for its complete comprehension *every* approach is valid, and that if we would master its fullest significance, we must accept the contributions of all sincere scholars and humanists, of historians as well as metaphysicians, of archivists as well as esthetes. Where many disciplines are fruitful, why should any one be considered ancillary or unnecessary to the others, why should any one arrogate to itself the role of pre-eminence? As C. S. Lewis wisely observes (*op. cit.* 22), "it is enough to point out that life and letters are inextricably intermixed."⁷

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

⁷ Detailed comment on certain misconceptions in S's pamphlet may perhaps be pertinent. Pages 3, 13. It is assumed that in the article attacked the summary of Rudel's poem omits the first stanza, but this is untrue since the words "after identifying his song with the spring-time music of brook, budding eglantine and nightingale" summarize that stanza. Pp. 3, 5. The article is misquoted. P. 4. The interpretation of *ab* and *danz vergier o sote cortina* offered by the article is that of other scholars. Pp. 4, 6, 9. S. attributes to the article the idea of an "amour charnel," "petite affaire," "consommation physique," etc. which was neither explicit nor implicit there. the contrast in Rudel was assumed to be between a *human* love, i. e. love of a real woman, and a *spiritual* love, i. e. the exalted, religious feeling which animated many who went to the Holy Land. Pp. 4, 13. The distinction between "love of a distant land" and "distant love" is that of Rudel, both can equally well refer to the Holy Land. P. 5. "une valeur inattaquable, seulement la parole du Christ est plus forte" these are S's words, not Rudel's. The poet says he leaves his love gladly because he goes seeking his *mêlts*, i. e. salvation as a crusader. P. 5. Whether Rudel's spiritual love is of the Holy Land or not, its realization can be symbolized by the figure "fed with manna." P. 7. S. and Casella interpret *joz* as the *gaudium* of the Church Fathers. Although the word did not seem to me "employé péjorativement," as S. assumes, but applied to a human, as opposed to a spiritual love, I *do* find a difference (S and Casella do not) between the *joz* of Rudel and that, for example, of Guillaume IX. P. 9. "[puisqu'il y

JOHN MILTON, SCRIVENER, 1590-1632

In Masson's *Life of Milton* and in subsequent biographical studies there are several questions about the business career of Milton's father which have never been answered. The early biographers agree that John Milton senior, when still young, was disinherited by his father. We know also that on February 27, 1600, when

a de la joie dans cette noble souffrance] donc " S again supplies an idea not found in Rudel and then proceeds to make the poet's words depend on it. How can "donc" refer to S's gloss? P. 10. Why should the poet be scorned as "défaitiste" if he says "a lover who prefers a human to a spiritual mistress is to be pitied"? Similar ideas abound in the *chansons de croisade*. P. 17. S accuses me of mistranslation. I was summarizing, not translating, and put Rudel's direct discourse in the third person in a contrary-to-fact clause after a verb of wishing. Pp. 17-18. "Mme Frank croit à un véritable pèlerin (ou croisé)" The word "crusader" was used neither by Rudel nor me. And Rudel's wish that he might be in the Holy Land as a pilgrim implies no reality. Knocking down men of straw is a favorite device in this paper. The ensuing disquisition on *forma* is irrelevant. Pp. 19-20. S suggests two alternative answers by which "Mme Frank semble vouloir répondre". The first I clearly stated, the second never occurred to me. The first he accepts, the second—his own man of straw—he rejects with additions *de son cru*. Here and elsewhere S. gratuitously attributes to me sins and language for which one of us certainly deserves censure. Cf. p. 13. "Mme Frank ne semble pas avoir lu la poésie . . . du commencement à la fin"; "Mme Frank pourrait parler . . . par le slogan 'conventional Natureingang'" [spretae injuria formae!]. Pp. 31 ff., 36, and elsewhere. My point of view is sometimes called "biographical," sometimes "biographico-allégorique". Neither of these terms is apposite; the first half of the hyphenated monstrosity is expressly repudiated in the article, the second never occurs there. On p. 38 S states that "le moyen âge n'a pas connu" "the biographic approach." What of the *vidas* and *razos* (between which S. seemingly makes no distinction, 2, 45, 46)? After all this, it is somewhat surprising to find that S in a long footnote relies on "une anecdote personnelle" for the interpretation of poem IV which somehow cannot be made to fit into his system (read *VIe str de IV*, not *IVe str de VI* on p. 71). To reduce this stanza and the following to metaphysical terms would indeed be difficult. They begin "it would have been better for me to lie dressed rather than undressed under the covers . . . the night when I was attacked." What of St. Augustine here, and the Pythagoreans and the *numerus* of the harmony of the world? In view of stanzas like these—and there are many in the early troubadours—is it sufficient or wholly enlightening to spin a beautiful *rayonnement métaphysique* about them based on generalizations derived from the Church Fathers?

about thirty-seven years old, he was admitted to the freedom of the Scriveners' Company. He had been apprenticed to a James Colbron, who had been admitted to the Company only five years before, on April 1, 1595.¹ Milton himself had at least five apprentices: William Bower and Richard Milton, admitted to the Company in 1621, James Hodgkinson and Thomas Bower, admitted 1624, and John Hatton, admitted 1628.² Milton was elected an Assistant of the Company in 1622, and a Steward in 1625. In 1627 he was fined for refusing to become Renter Warden, and in 1634, after his retirement to Horton, he was fined for refusing to become Master. He was obviously a prominent and prosperous scrivener.

In the light of these facts Masson finds it

worthy of notice that his name does not occur in the list of twenty-seven scriveners who are named in the Charter of 1616 [January 28, 1617] as the first office-bearers of the Company in its new shape. It is possible that he stood aloof from the movement for incorporation.³

It is possible, but we have no cause to speculate. The charter officials—the Master, two Wardens, and twenty-four members of the court of Assistants—were all chosen on the basis of service or seniority, and only three had been admitted to the Company so late as 1597.⁴ A freeman of 1600, like Milton, had no choice in the matter, even if the list had been enlarged, members from 1598 and 1599 would have had precedence. The absence of Milton's name tells us, therefore, nothing about his attitude or his professional prestige.

Milton's master, James Colbron,⁵ had been a member of the

¹ Masson, *Life*, I (1881), 25-26, on the authority of Hyde Clarke.

² These facts, and other facts about early scriveners used in this article, are from Bodleian MS Rawl D 51, which lists officers and members of the Company, 1392-1678. Milton had other "servants," probably apprentices, who never became members of the Company: Peter Jones (1603), Oliver Lowe (died in January, 1610), Henry Rothwell (1628-1631), William Bold (1615). The manuscript does not confirm Masson's statement (*ibid.*, p. 62) that Milton was elected an Assistant on April 14, 1615.

³ *Life*, I (1881), 62.

⁴ Apart from the current Master and Wardens, the 1617 court of Assistants included five former masters and four former wardens. Eleven of the younger members later became Master, and two others were "fined" Master. Six (like James Colbron) apparently died before their turn came; the others were elected in strict order of seniority.

⁵ Colbron had been apprenticed to Baldwin Castleton, who was made free of the Company in 1577, was chosen Warden in 1601, and was buried

Company less than five years when Milton himself was admitted, and therefore, according to Masson, either

Milton had served a portion of the usual seven years' apprenticeship with some previous master and had been transferred to Colbron to serve out the rest, or the Scriveners' Company had accepted the imperfect apprenticeship with Colbron as itself sufficient in the circumstances⁶

Although evidence for the first possibility is plentiful in the records of the Company, there is none in the Milton entries. Masson consequently favors the second alternative, which, he argues, "tallies exactly with the story that has come down to us from Aubrey and Phillips." Before examining the accounts of these early biographers, let us, however, note that if Milton entered his profession in unusual circumstances, the year in which he began was an unusual year, for in it, two other persons, Richard Chapman and John Ellis, were admitted to the Company after an apprenticeship with men⁷ who, like Milton's master, had been admitted in 1595. It would seem that Milton's case was not unique.

The explanation, I submit, is quite simple. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there were many practising scribes who never troubled to become freemen of the Scriveners' Company. It was not absolutely necessary to be a member. Some scribes sought admittance after having been engaged in the business for many years.⁸

July 3, 1602, at St Mary le Bowe Colbron, an Assistant when the Company was incorporated in 1617, was Warden in 1618 and 1619. On December 6, 1694, he was licensed to marry Mercy Withins, daughter of Richard Withins, haberdasher, of St Lawrence Jewry (*Publications, Harleian Soc*, xxv, 220). He had four apprentices who were admitted to the Company, and his son Thomas was admitted in 1622. Colbron was probably dead before 1626, when it was apparently his turn, as a charter official, to become Master of the Company, Charles Bostock, next in seniority on the list of Assistants, was elected.

⁶ *Life*, I (1881), 26

⁷ Charles Bostock and Godfrey Reynor. These two, like Colbron, later became charter Assistants; furthermore, they each lived to become Master in their turn.

⁸ In my study of London parish registers and marriage allegations I have noted in each decade from 1580 to 1670 at least five practising scribes whose names are not in the MS list of members of the Company. In the decade following 1660 I found thirty. Godfrey Reynor, mentioned in the footnote above, actually had an apprentice, James Evans, who was

Once these facts are realized it becomes obvious that Milton's apprenticeship under Colbron might have begun in 1593 and terminated with admission to the Company in 1600. Moreover, it is not impossible that the apprenticeship began as early as 1583, when Milton was twenty, for the early biographers seem to emphasize the fact that he was young when he started in business. None of them recognize or imply a ten or fifteen year period, which modern biographers have assumed,⁹ between his disinheritance as a youth and his entrance upon a profession. No biographers, old or new, have accounted for such a period, or have explained how a disinherited son could marry well, own property, support servants, and prosper soon after beginning work as a scrivener. Edward Phillips states that Milton voluntarily became a scrivener "by the advice and assistance of an intimate friend of his, eminent in that calling, upon his being cast out by his father, a bigotted Roman Catholic, for embracing, when young, the protestant faith." Aubrey declares that the father "disinherited him because he kept not the Catholic religion, so thereupon he came to London and became a scrivener." The anonymous biographer tells the story of the disinheritance and continues "Upon this occasion he came young to London, and being taken care of by a relation of his, a scrivener, he became free of that profession"¹⁰

Fortunately there is additional evidence, which makes it reasonably clear that Milton was, not an apprentice, but a practising scrivener as early as 1590. His apprentice, Thomas Bower, testified under oath in 1631 that he had been Milton's partner in business "for the space of six years now past"¹¹ In other words, they

admitted in 1583, although Reynor himself was not admitted until 1595. A few other examples John Shawe, in business as early as 1580, admitted 1589, John Hiberd, 1594, admitted 1600, Christopher Nailer, 1622, admitted 1631, Sir Robert Hanson, 1641 or earlier, admitted 1666

⁹ For example, see Masson, *Life*, I, 24 and 27, or Ernest Brennecke, *John Milton the Elder* (1938), pp 43-48.

¹⁰ *Early Lives of Milton*, ed Helen Darbishire, pp 1, 18, 50-51. Aubrey also notes that Milton was "brought up by a friend of his", but he is incorrect in adding "was not an apprentice," for the books of the Company state otherwise.

¹¹ Answer of May 3, 1631, in the chancery case of Rose Downer vs Milton. See J. M. French, *Milton in Chancery* (1939), p 243, for a transcript of the document. Bower testified that he "was" Milton's servant (1 e

entered upon partnership in 1625, immediately after Bower became a freeman of the Scriveners' Company (and immediately after John Milton junior became a student at Cambridge University) On April 13, 1637, Milton testified under oath that he had invested money for John Cotton "before the co-partnership betwixt this defendant and the said Thomas Bower about the space of thirty and five years, as this defendant taketh it, and after this co-partnership for the space of two years or thereabouts"¹² If this statement can be trusted, Milton was in business as a scrivener about thirty-five years before 1625—and doing well too, if John Cotton was a typical client.

To summarize the poet's father was disinherited as a youth; he retired to London (as Anthony à Wood says) "to seek, in a manner, his fortune"; an unidentified friend or relative¹³ encouraged him to become a scrivener, in 1583 or earlier, when he was barely twenty, he began his apprenticeship; by 1590 "or thereabouts" he was active in business, in 1600 he was admitted a freeman of the Company, and finally, in 1625, when his son and heir left for the University,¹⁴ he took a recent apprentice as his

apprentice) for eight years, and "hath been" a partner for six years In the same case Milton himself testified that Bower was in 1628, "and still is," a partner He did not say or imply that the partnership began in 1628, and we have no reason to doubt Bower's statement.

¹² French, *op cit*, p 272 Milton is more likely to be accurate on this point than young Bower, who "doth believe and hath been informed by the said Mr Milton" that business dealings between Cotton and Milton had been in progress "for thirty years or thereabouts" (p 266). Milton elsewhere puts the total time of the active business relationship, which ended in 1630, as "the space of near forty years" (pp 271-2). His estimate of "two years or thereabouts" *after* the partnership with Bower may seem, at first thought, not strictly accurate, for a half dozen investments were made for John Cotton in 1628-30 In its context, however, this statement refers to fortunate investments, when Cotton "sustained no loss at all" and was therefore content Probably things started going wrong in 1628, because Cotton was ready in 1630 to take a loss for a cash settlement

¹³ This friend may, of course, be James Colbron, as Masson supposes It is interesting to note that a John Lane became a freeman of the Scriveners in 1581 Could this be Milton's later friend, noted by many biographers? To speculate further— is there any connection between Colbron's master, Castleton, and the unidentified Castons in the ancestry of the poet's mother?

¹⁴ Only a coincidence? The poet tells us that his parents intended him

partner. These seem to me the most likely inferences from the evidence. Their implications in regard to Milton's marriage and his activities as a musician remain to be explored

WILLIAM R. PARKER

The Ohio State University

MILTON'S WINGED SERPENTS

Describing one of the events of the sixth day of Creation, Milton writes:

some of the Serpent kind
Wondrous in length and corpulence involv'd
Their Snaky folds, and added wings (PL, VII, 482-4)

Verity's annotation on this passage, which Fletcher accepts in the revised Cambridge edition, is "dragons." In M. Y. Hughes' edition, we find a reference to the *De rerum natura* with the statement that "like Lucretius, Milton thought of the earth in the beginning as bringing forth monsters." Neither of these conjectures is quite correct. In Milton's age the doctrine of the great chain of being ruled out the existence of any creatures in ancient times that could not be found in the contemporary world. Dragons were to be found in popular literature, but learned men like Scaliger or Bochart thought of them as purely mythological beasts. It is my belief that Milton thought neither in terms of dragons nor of primeval monsters, that he meant "winged serpents," which he knew existed not only in past times but could also be seen in remote parts of his own world.

The explanation of Milton's flying snakes is based on classical, Biblical, and contemporary authorities. We know that Milton read Herodotus for his account of Xerxes' bridge (PL, x, 306-11). In the same work, he could have read an account of Herodotus' visit to Buto in Arabia, where each spring there was a fight between the ibises and swarms of winged serpents (*πτερωτῶν ὀφίων*) that flew in from Egypt.¹ In seventeenth century editions of Herodotus, the

for the ministry, but did the father never entertain the thought of his son succeeding him in his flourishing business?

¹ *Historiae* (Ed. C. Hude, Oxford, 1908), II, 75.

reader is referred to Pausanias, ix, 21, where there are further remarks about this species of snake. These are the obvious classical sources, but the Biblical source would impress Milton more.

Though variously described, there is a flying serpent that wings his way through Isaiah 30 6, a fearful passage about feral life in the desert. In the Hebrew text, he is a "fiery flying serpent" (אִפְעָה וְשָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף), in the Septuagint text, he is "the offspring of flying serpents" (ἐκγονα ἀσπίδων πετομένων); and in the Vulgate version, he is simply "vipera et regulus volans." The exegetes exercised their wits on this verse, but what they have to say was summed up in Milton's day by the learned orientalist, Samuel Bochart, in his *Hierozoicon*, a vast work on Biblical natural history. He expounds the verse in a lengthy chapter,² and adds many Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Arabic commentaries. Besides the classical and Biblical sanctions for winged serpents, there were also contemporary witnesses.

Though he scoffed at the existence of dragons, J. C. Scaliger was ready to admit the winged serpent to his *tiergarten*. In his *Exotericarum exercitationum liber xv*, he writes "Mons, qui Marsingae regnum dividit a Malabaris, multas alit feras: inter quas alatos Angues arboribus insidentes. Quos, aiunt, solo afflatu, vel etiam obtutu eos, qui propius accedant, interficere."³ Now Scaliger got his hint from Cardano, who wrote of winged snakes in the *De varietate rerum*, and Cardano unquestionably drew on the *Libro dell'Indie Orientali* of the Portuguese voyager, Odoardo Barbessa. As far as Milton knew, there were serpents adding wings in seventeenth century Malabar.

But this is perhaps pedantry, for the news about the serpent had leaked out to the "university wits" of Elizabeth's reign. In the Tudor play *Selimus*, we read,

From foorth the fennes of venemores *Affrica*
The generation of those flying snakes
Do band themselves in troupes (1677-9)

Under these circumstances, I suspect that the correct gloss on this passage is "winged serpents."

DON CAMERON ALLEN

² *Op. cit.* (London, 1668), iii, cols. 421-8. The first edition appeared at London in 1663. I am not implying that Milton knew this book, but all the authorities available to Bochart were also available to Milton.

³ *Op. cit.* (Frankfurt, 1612), p. 602.

SHELLEY AND THE REVIEWERS ONCE MORE

The following reviews, not hitherto reprinted, supplement Professor Newman I. White's *The Unextinguished Hearth Shelley and His Contemporary Critics*

Original Poetry by Victor and Cazire, reviewed by the *Antijacobin Review*, October, 1810 (37-206)

Master Victor and Miss Cazire have furnished us with *Original Poetry*, translated from the Italian and the German. It was not a German, however, who wrote the second line in this volume, "First of *this* thing, and *that* thing, and *t'other* thing think," nor we hope a chemist who pronounced the sentence, "Or you must bleach for aye in flame —" neither a poet nor a poetess, who said, "But he fears, for he knows she is not common game." One piece of very important information we must add, that the first and second are dated Jan. 1810, the third, Apr. 30, 1810, if the reader wishes more we must refer to this elegant volume.

The Revolt of Islam, a Poem, reviewed by *The Man of Kent*, November, 1818 (1-157-160)

(From a Correspondent)

This is no ordinary production: it evinces natural powers hardly inferior to those of any writer of the present day, and the little notice that has been taken of it by the timid or venal dispensers of periodical criticism, renders it an imperative duty to a publication like the *Man of Kent*, distinguished for the liberality of its principles, to bear witness to, and accelerate the progress of that spirit which is silently, but powerfully pervading mankind, and which may sometime wake in a voice of thunder and frighten into annihilation the weak and wicked supporters of oppression and bigotry.

"And from the lips of truth one mighty breath
Shall like a whirlwind scatter in its breeze
The whole dark pile of human mockeries
Then shall the reign of mind commence on earth
And starting fresh as from a second birth,
Man in the sunshine of the world's new spring
Shall walk transparent like some holy thing"

MOORE

But of this significant neglect, however, the Author seems to have been aware, for in the course of a somewhat confident preface, he says, "I have sought to write as I believe that Homer, Shakespeare, and Milton wrote, with an utter disregard of anonymous censure. I am certain that calumny and misrepresentation, though it may move me to compassion, cannot dis-

turb my peace, and *I shall understand the expressive silence of those sagacious enemies who dare not trust themselves to speak*"

The work purposes to be "an experiment on the temper of the public mind, as to how far a thirst for a happier condition of moral and political society, survives the tempests which have shaken the age in which we live," exhibited in a succession of pictures illustrating the growth and progress of individual mind aspiring after excellence, and devoted to the love of mankind its influence in refining and making pure, the most daring and uncommon impulses of the imagination, the understanding, and the senses, its impatience "at all the oppressions that are done under the sun," its tendency to awaken public hope, and to enlighten and improve mankind, the rapid effects of the application of that tendency, the awakening of an immense nation from this slavery and degradation, to a true sense of moral dignity and freedom, the dethronement of their oppressors, and the unveiling of the religious frauds by which they had been deluded into submission, the tranquility of successful patriotism, and the universal toleration and benevolence of true philosophy; the treachery and barbarity of hired soldiers, vice not the object of punishment and hatred, but of kindness and pity, the faithlessness of tyrants, the confederacy of the rulers of the world, and the restoration of the expelled dynasty by foreign arms; the massacre and extermination of the patriots, and the victory of established power, the consequences of legitimate despotism, civil war, famine, plague, superstition, and an utter extinction of the domestic affections, the judicial murder of the advocates of liberty, the temporary triumph of oppression, that secure earnest of its final and inevitable fall; the transient nature of ignorance and error, and the eternity of genius and virtue." The preface concludes by observing that in the whole course of the Poem "There is no quarter given to revenge, or envy, or prejudice. Love is every where celebrated as the sole law which should govern the moral world."

A poetical dedication to a female friend, contains many delightful passages, but the limits to which I must necessarily confine myself, will not allow of quotation. I proceed to give a short abstract of the story, with some extracts, which perhaps will justify the favourable opinion formed of the work. The first Canto, which is merely introductory, however finely written, is I fear too abstruse and allegorical for popular apprehension. It is thronged, as is the whole Poem, with vivid and beautiful images; the following stanza may serve as a specimen.

[Quotes Canto I, Stanza 16.]

In the world of Spirits to which the Author is supposed to be introduced,
[Quotes Canto I, Stanza 54]

And among others, those of Laon, a Grecian youth, and of his beloved companion Cythna—

... "late return'd

"Like birds of calm from the world's raging sea."

The former of whom relates their adventures and sufferings on earth, in the subsequent Cantos.

Laon, indignant at the yoke under which his once glorious country is labouring, projects with Cythna, the sharer of his solitude and visionary enthusiasm for freedom and love, the emancipation of his fellow creatures from the degrading tyranny of custom and prejudice, when suddenly they are attacked by the slaves of the Sultan, who bear off Cynthna to his seraglio, while Laon, senseless from the wounds he received in defending her, is exposed on the top of a lofty column, where his sufferings, and consequent madness, are fearfully described, but from which he is at length delivered by a hermit, in whose cell, after an interval of seven years, he at length recovers his health and senses, and hearing that a maiden of wonderful powers of mind, had excited the people to a revolt, he hastens to join them it proves to be Cythna they are for a time victorious, but a combination of despots coming to the assistance of the Tyrant, the asserters of Liberty are overwhelmed and Laon and Cythna condemned to be burnt alive, they die, rejoicing, though unsuccessful, at the light they have diffused among mankind, and their spirits are wafted to the Islands of the blest In the second canto, Cythna is thus described,

[Quotes Canto II, Stanzas 23, 28, 31]

In Canto 4th, the incipient agitations of a Revolution,

[Quotes Canto IV, Stanza 14]

In the 6th the caresses of Laon and Cythna,

[Quotes Canto VI, Stanzas 33, 34]

In the 10th, after war and famine,

[Quotes Canto X, Stanzas 20, 21, 22]

But I must now conclude, for the citation of every passage of force or beauty, would be endless

The faults of this performance are, that its drift and aim will not be clearly understood by that class to whom it might be of use The style is in some instances over-wrought, and "*horrors heaped on horrors head*" with a sort of German exaggeration. Many verbal inaccuracies may be observed, evidently the result of haste and carelessness, but they are but spots in the Sun

Canterbury

These reviews substantiate Professor White's view that Shelley was not "largely ignored and misunderstood by the contemporary reviewers." The first also shows that Shelley's early anonymous publications received more attention than they deserved, the second, that Shelley found staunch supporters among the review editors for a poem that was regarded by many as radical enough "to array all conservative feeling against it"

The authorship of the *Man of Kent* review is also a matter of interest. It bears the signature of a hand with the index finger

extended, a signature often employed by Leigh Hunt; the caption preceding the review reads "From a Correspondent," who purports to come from Canterbury. In his political and poetical opinions this anonymous reviewer could well have been Hunt, but I have not yet found clear-cut evidence which proves Hunt to have been the Correspondent, or which even links him with Canterbury or establishes him as a contributor to the *Man of Kent*. There are some interesting similarities between this review and the one by Hunt in the *Examiner* a few months earlier. The former opens with "This is no ordinary production," the latter with "This is an extraordinary production", there is slight identity in the quotations from the poem and its preface, and each review finds fault with the "overwrought" style and fears that the poem will not be understood by the class to whom it might be of use. Yet, despite these similarities and the evidence observed above it is possible to make no more than a very tentative ascription of the review to Shelley's friend, the editor of the *Examiner*.

WILLIAM S. WARD

University of Kentucky

SHELLEY'S REVISED WILL

Shelley's biographers have consistently failed to comment on one rather interesting detail in the poet's life: the new will which Shelley made while in Italy and which at his death was searched for and was either never found or was recovered in so imperfect a state as to be unusable. The most important piece of evidence is an unpublished letter from John Gisborne to T. J. Hogg, dated August 12, 1822.¹ Mr. Gisborne has, he said, received a short letter from Hunt about Shelley's death on July 8. Peacock had had a letter from Mary, and had written to Hogg, who, Mr. Gisborne understood, had been appointed executor instead of Lord Byron, in a will written about three years ago. This will Mr. Gisborne himself had witnessed. Thus far Mary had been unable to find it

¹ This letter I am not permitted to quote. It is among the Hogg MSS. which will eventually be published as *Shelley Letters*.

among Shelley's papers. From Mr. Gisborne's letter we may safely infer that in her letter to Peacock Mary had mentioned the new will, her vain search for it, and probably Hogg's executorship. If Mr. Gisborne's memory was reliable, the new will had been made in 1819, probably because of the death of William Shelley in June. The Shelleys were at Leghorn near the Gisbornes during the summer and early autumn of 1819.

The search for the new will continued for some time. From Cephalonia Trelawny wrote to Mary on September 6, 1823:

My chief motive of writing is to inform you of a most singular discovery I have most unlooked for made, 'tis briefly this A Mr Hamilton Brown, with a Greek mistress, lived last year at the same lodgings you had when at the Baths of Pisa, during his residence there, a woman of the house gave him some loose sheets of paper, which turned out to be a will or deed of Shelley's, every separate sheet was signed by him and witnessed, he thinks the first part is not amongst them, but is not certain, for he, conceiving it was only a copy, took no note of it, he has it, however, with his papers left at Leghorn, and I will take care to get it forwarded to you, as Mr Brown returns to England in about four or five months, at present he is going to Greece with me, he was formerly, indeed, Secretary to General Maitland, at Corfu Now you will know whether this is the lost *deed* or a copy, and if it is imperfect the woman at Pisa Baths may have the rest^a

In March 1824 Mary replied.

I wrote to Mrs Mason about the remainder of the Will which you say Mr H Browne had from the people from whom we rented a house at the Baths of Pisa—in her reply she says 'The result of my inquiries is that no papers whatever were found after your departure, consequently no person can be in possession of the Document you mention by that means. Mrs Turbat (the woman of the house) added that had there been any papers, she must have found them, as she always examines every part of the house herself the moment strangers leave it' There is probably some mistake in the place—you described the papers so accurately that I cannot doubt of their being those I sought—I wish I could have them as soon as possible I know exactly the place where Mr H. Browne got them^b

Mary finished her letter to Trelawny on March 22, on which day "Mr. Hamilton Browne called on me." If on that occasion Brown delivered the "loose sheets of paper" signed by Shelley, they must

^a Unpublished, printed in *Shelley and Mary*, iv, 975.

^b First published, Norman, Okla., October, 1944, in *The Letters of Mary W. Shelley*, ed F. L. Jones, i, 289-90.

have proved unsatisfactory, for it was the old will made before the poet left England that was finally proved and executed in 1844.

Even this unrecovered will of 1819 did not satisfy Shelley. On April 10, 1822, he wrote from Pisa to John Gisborne⁴ in London, explaining the general state of his affairs and asking Mr. Gisborne's advice about getting another solicitor to help him straighten them out. P. W. Longdill, his present solicitor, was, he thought, not interested in anything except his large fees. Shelley was, of course, looking forward to the death of his father, which he expected at any moment to occur. In the letter Shelley says, "I desire also, at *present*, to make a new will, as changes have taken place which render such a measure necessary." These changes might have included the birth of Percy Florence on November 12, 1819 (depending upon the date of the new will of 1819), and certainly involved his strained relationship with Byron. Evidently in the 1819 will Byron had already been displaced by Hogg as joint executor with Peacock. The new will would probably have removed the bequest of £2,000 to Byron (which, upon Shelley's death, Byron refused for himself and his heirs). When he wrote Mr. Gisborne on April 10, he could not, however, have been influenced by the death of Allegra, which did not occur until April 18 and was not then expected. There are two other indications of the changes he intended to make in his will. On October 30, 1826, Mary Shelley wrote to Leigh Hunt⁵ to say that her husband had meant to leave £2,000 to him and that she regarded this as a solemn obligation. When in 1844 the will was finally executed, she also stated by inference that Shelley had meant to leave to Claire only £6,000 instead of the £12,000 which she actually received.⁶

FREDERICK L. JONES

Mercer University
(Lieutenant, USNR)

⁴ Julian Edition of Shelley's *Works*, Letters, x, 373-74.

⁵ *The Letters of Mary W. Shelley*, ed. F. L. Jones, I, 349.

⁶ Mary Shelley to Leigh Hunt, April 20, 1844, *Ibid.*, II, 218.—Claire received two separate legacies of £6,000 each. The will shows that this was Shelley's intention and not a lawyer's mistake. Jeaffreson is probably right in thinking that one legacy was intended for Allegra, and that it would probably have been cancelled if Shelley had made a new will after her death. (See *The Real Shelley*, II, 324-27.)

THE STOPPAGE OF SHELLEY'S INCOME IN 1821

On April 11, 1821, the Shelleys in Italy received, according to Mary's journal, "a letter that overturns us."¹ The letter was from Horace Smith, who, acting as Shelley's financial agent in London, had called at the bankers on March 28 for the quarterly amount, only to be told that payment had been discontinued. No explanation was offered, nor could he learn if the poet were informed of the situation.² Mary's notation of April 13 is "an explanation of our difficulty,"³ and on that day Shelley wrote to Miss Clairmont in Florence

The whole business merely consists in the omission of the payment of £30 to Hume, and that rascal Longdill [Shelley's London attorney] having taken out an order against my whole income—a mistake remedied as quickly as known

Shelley's principal biographers have apparently accepted this statement without question. But evidence here set forth supports a different conclusion, and in addition helps to disprove the conjecture of a misdated letter.

In the settlement of the Chancery suit of 1819, the two children of Shelley's first marriage were placed under the guardianship of a Dr. Hume and his wife, whom Longdill recommended as their custodian. Shelley's share in their maintenance amounted to £120 *per annum*.⁴ It appears that the quarterly payments were not care-

¹ *Shelley and Mary* (Privately printed, 1882), III, 604. (References are to M. L. A. Rotograph 278, deposited in the Library of Congress.)

² The letter is given in *Shelley and Mary* (III, 598-600) under date of April 3, 1821. An abbreviated version is printed in *Shelley Memorials* (pp. 182-3) under date of March 28, 1821. This is obviously the letter from which Shelley first learned of the stoppage of his income. It should be dated March 28 from Smith's statement "I called to-day at Brookes and Co. for your money . . ." and a parallel passage from his letter to Sir Timothy (April 13, 1821), "till I called, on the 28th March last, with my usual order on Messrs. Brookes and Co. . . ." The letter of April 3, apparently un preserved, but mentioned by Smith on April 17, ". . . I wrote you on the 3^d of this month . . .", was undoubtedly the one from which Shelley had his explanation of the difficulty.

³ *Shelley and Mary*, III, 604.

⁴ Dowden's *Life of Shelley*, II, 92-3. Particular reference to Longdill's having recommended Hume as custodian for the children is found in Horace Smith's letter to Shelley, April 17, 1821, *Shelley and Mary*, III, 610.

fully attended to, for in a letter dated February 17, 1820, Shelley wrote to Dr. Hume

If you will take the trouble to present the enclosed note to my friend Mr Smith of the Stock Exchange any day after the 25th of March, that quarter together with the quarter in arrear will be paid, and such measures are [altered from *shall be*] taken as will [altered from *may*] prevent any possible future misunderstanding on the subject

Mr Roger Ingpen, in an edition of Shelley's correspondence,⁵ questioned if this letter be not misdated for 1821. But in her journal for February 17, 1820, Mary wrote, "Yesterday, a letter from Longdill",⁶ and if (as we may conjecture from the close relationship between the attorney and the guardian) the letter from Longdill concerned the indebtedness to Hume, Shelley's letter to Hume was, in effect, an answer to Longdill, and rightly bears the 1820 date

From a letter of April 13, 1821, to Sir Timothy Shelley, the poet's father, we know that in 1820, Dr Hume did apply to Horace Smith, who "mentioned his application in more than one letter to Italy." In November, 1820, Smith wrote to Dr. Hume, and received no reply, concluding very naturally that the money had been paid. Thus the affair rested, until the stoppage in March, 1821. From the same letter, we know that when Horace Smith called a second time at the bankers, he found

. . . that the money had all along been *lying in their hands* to the amount of Dr Hume's claim within a trifle (which I presume are postages or some petty charges, with which Mr Shelley was unacquainted), and that they had only been prevented paying it at once by the want of a regular, formal cheque or order.⁷

The settlement of the matter had been so long delayed that when Horace Smith (as he wrote to Shelley on April 17, 1821) called on Longdill,

he at once confessed that he was a party to the proceedings against you, in order, as he said, to get Dr. Hume paid, whom he had himself recommended as custodian to the children. . . From him I came home . . . and on my arrival, Hume's letter was put into my hand, whence I found

⁵ Julian Edition, x, 238.

⁶ *Shelley and Mary*, III, 475.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III, 613-4. From a copy of the letter which Smith sent to Shelley in Italy. (*Ibid.*, note.)

that Sir Timothy was also made a party, and observed the alacrity with which Mr Whitton [Sir Timothy's attorney] had recommended Chancery applications, and the impounding of £250 to pay £120⁸

This last statement is of particular interest, since it indicates that "the whole business" did not consist "in the omission of the payment of £30" [i. e., the quarterly amount], as Shelley had stated in his letter to Claire, but that Dr. Hume's bill had remained unpaid for the entire year previous, or until it amounted to £120.⁹

From Sir Timothy's answer to Smith,¹⁰ we know that he was entirely innocent of any part in the proceedings, that he was implicated without being consulted. Horace Smith, however, soon saw the matter straightened out. On June 15, he wrote to Shelley

The Chancellor decreed that the £30 should be regularly reserved for Dr Hume, and on calling at Wight and Co [Sir Timothy's agents], I found a letter from Sir Timothy, desiring them to pay over the remainder of the March quarter *without deduction*, and in future to pay regularly £220 instead of £250¹¹

NAT LEWIS KADERLY

Mercer University

BYRON'S HOURS OF IDLENESS AND OTHER THAN SCOTCH REVIEWERS

That the *Edinburgh Review's* strong censure of *Hours of Idleness* provoked much of the ire displayed in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* is well known. What other magazine reviewers thought of the volume, however, has been passed over in almost complete silence¹. Yet it had sixteen original reviews and one other which

⁸ *Ibid*, 610-11. The £250 was the quarterly payment of his income

⁹ The same statement occurs in Smith's letter to Sir Timothy (*Shelley and Mary*, III, 614), "and why £250 was finally impounded to pay £120 . . ."

¹⁰ April 17, 1821. *Shelley and Mary*, III, 615

¹¹ *Ibid*, III, 639

¹ Byron's biographers have given little attention to the reviews of *Hours of Idleness*, except that in the *Edinburgh Review*. Only five of the seventeen critical notices have been referred to at all, and four of these references are brief and somewhat oblique. Reviews not previously cited by students of Byron are indicated herein by an asterisk.

quoted excerpts from six of the original criticisms. A chronological summary will indicate their general tenor.

Monthly Literary Recreations, or, Magazine of General Information and Amusement, July, 1807 (3: 67-71): The author's "beauties grow on the soil of genius, which, therefore, ought to be carefully cultivated, and not permitted to sink into a barren soil."

**Universal Magazine*, September, 1807 (ns, 8: 235-7): "... upon the whole Lord Byron need feel no regret at having committed his name to the public in the present volume." These poems "do no discredit to his youth, many of them are elegant and interesting, and almost all possess a neat and harmonious versification."

Critical Review, September, 1807 (s3, 12: 47-53): The author displays "a correct taste, a warm imagination, and a feeling heart."

**Satirist, or Monthly Meteor*, October, 1807 (1: 77-81): Both the preface and the poems are full of dull stupidities. In his better poems the author rises "almost to mediocrity."

**Le Beau Monde, or, Literary and Fashionable Magazine*, September, 1807 (2: 88-90): The translations and imitations are regarded as mediocre school exercises, but as a juvenile production the volume is warmly commended. Judged from any standard, it is "in no need of extenuating considerations to arrest the arm of censure."

**British Critic*, October, 1807 (30: 436-7): "This is very ingenious idleness, and has produced some elegant and interesting compositions. There is much taste, and more vigour than might reasonably be expected from a minor."

**Literary Panorama*, November, 1807 (3: 273-5): "The author is not an imbecile, but he is an incautious writer: he is spirited, but not always correct, wildish, but, when he is *broke in* that mettle which he shows may prove to his advantage."

**Monthly Review, or Literary Journal*, November, 1807 (54: 256-63): Byron is commended for his "ease and strength," his fire, and his mental power, but it is hoped that in the future "he will render them beneficial to man."

Eclectic Review, November, 1807 (3: 989-93): Despite poems which display only moderate merit, Byron reveals more talent than is usually found in a poet so young. It is regretted, however, that so much prominence "is given to voluptuous themes and visions." In spite of the merits of the poems, therefore, it is necessary "to pronounce the volume itself unsuitable for any refined reader or well regulated family."

Antijacobin Review, December, 1807 (28: 407-8): The poems are approved in the colorless, routine critical jargon of the day:

" . they exhibit strong proofs of genius, accompanied by a lively but chastened imagination, a classical taste, and a benevolent heart"

**Annual Review, and History of Literature*, 1807 (6 529-31) The poems "give proof of very promising talents, the age of the author at the time of writing them considered."

**New Annual Register*, 1807 (28 [379]) ". . . a series of original poems and translations, that reflect equal credit on his Lordship's rank and age of life, and which few noblemen, and still fewer noble minors, are able to equal"

**Gentleman's Magazine*, Supplement for 1807 (77². 1217-21). The poems are of "a very superior description" and "display, in an eminent degree, an elevated taste, and, considered as the production of a youth who has only recently attained his nineteenth year, are deserving of the highest commendation."

**Poetical Register and Repository of Fugitive Poetry*, 1807 (6 538-9) Though some of the poems are uninteresting and incorrect, "The collection, on the whole, gives promise, we think, of future excellence."

Edinburgh Review, January, 1808 (11. 285-9) "The poesy of this young lord belongs to the class which neither gods nor men are said to permit. . . . His effusions are spread over a dead flat, and can no more get above or below the level, than if they were so much stagnant water."

**Monthly Mirror*, January, 1808 (ns, 3. 28-30) . "We know little of the peerage, and nothing of Lord Byron's family, but we shrewdly guess that he is descended from *Lord Lovett*, who, as our nurse once told us, *walked and talked half an hour after his head was cut off*, which piece of ingenuity of his ancestor he has improved upon, by actually *writing* in the very same predicament. . . . If this was one of his lordship's *school exercises* at Harrow, and he escaped whipping, they have there either an undue respect for lord's bottoms, or they do not deserve the reputation they have acquired."

**Satirist, or Monthly Meteor*, May, 1808 (2 333-5) . Seven months after its disparaging original review, noted above, this magazine again entered the lists to quote from the *British Critic*, *Monthly Review*, *Universal Magazine*, *Critical Review*, *Eclectic Review*, and *Edinburgh Review*. The first four of these are in the vein of commendation, the fifth mixes praise and censure; and the last is wholly derogatory.

Had Byron read all of these reviews, he would have felt flattered; for of the sixteen original ones eleven were preponderantly favorable, whereas only three were preponderantly unfavorable, and two were as generous with praise as with censure. How many of them

he read we can never know, but his eye presumably did not fall upon the October, 1807, issue of the *Saturnist* and the January, 1808, number of the *Monthly Mirror*, for they are about as personal, sarcastic, and abusive as the "Scotch Review." Yet he took no note of either.

WILLIAM S. WARD

University of Kentucky

SCOTT'S *ANTIQUARY* AND DEFOE'S *HISTORY OF APPARITIONS*

Critics have usually agreed in considering *The Antiquary* "a novel of contemporary life, a story of familiar characters."¹ But on this showing, what explanation is one to give for the strange episode of the chest of silver bullion which was dug up amid the ruins of the old priory, together with the quest for "Search No 2" into which Edie Ochiltree lured the Adept at midnight?

"This was a very romantic, foolish exploit," remarked the matter-of-fact Oldbuck. "... I think your contrivance succeeded better than such a clumsy one deserved, Edie."²

Like the "Supposed Apparition of Morton" which Scott himself said was "taken from a story in the *History of Apparitions* written by Daniel Defoe" (*Old Mortality*, Note 35), this episode seems to have been suggested by a tale in *The History of Apparitions*. A comparison of the incidents will serve to indicate the probable indebtedness:

*The History and Reality of Apparitions*³

A peddler was led by an apparition, late at night, to "a great stone." The next night the peddler returned to the indicated place with a spade and a pickaxe, and he dug until he struck a large chest. "He

*The Antiquary*⁴

The mendicant Edie Ochiltree persuaded a searching party to dig with pickaxes and shovels below a "muckle stane" in the priory ruins. Five feet down, Edie struck some object with his pike-staff, and the laborers, who had deserted the pit,

¹ John Buchan, *Sir Walter Scott* (London, 1932), p. 149.

² *The Antiquary*, ch. 44 (Dryburgh ed., pp. 399, 400).

³ Tegg ed, pp. 378-382.

⁴ Chapters 23-25 (Dryburgh ed., pp. 218-236).

doubled his diligence when he came to the chest and, with great labour," he lifted up the chest and found it full of silver. He carried off both the silver and the chest, and afterwards he used the chest to make a hatch to his shop door. An old gentleman noticed on the new hatch (the former chest) an inscription in "old Saxon English in the ancient Gothic character," which might be read,

"Where this once stood,
Stands another twice as good"

The peddler was incited by this inscription to return to the original hiding place at night, and after digging deeper than before, he found another chest, "not so big as the other, but richer, for as the first was full of silver, so this was full of gold"

scrambled back and dug until they had unearthed a chest, so heavy that all hands were needed to lift it out. It was found to contain silver, which was carried away by the searching party. But Edie laid the lid of the chest aside, and when the others had left he pointed out to the Adept that the inscription on the lid "in the ordinary black letter" spelled "Search No 1." When the adept surmised the existence of a "Search No 2," Edie added that he had always heard that the legendary buried treasure contained much gold. If the second chest, he said, "be but—say the tenth part o' the size o' the kist No 1, it will double its value, being filled wi' gowd instead of silver." At midnight Edie and the Adept came with pickaxe and shovel, and they dug in the original hole until the Adept broke the pickaxe against a foundation stone of the priory ruins.

It is characteristic of Scott that his version of the episode (despite its suspense, which sustains interest in the story while the principal events must mark time) was narrated in a tone of broad comedy, with its main emphasis on Edie's mischievous ridicule of the pretensions of the Adept. Furthermore, the mystery of the inscription on the lid was later explained away, when Oldbuck recalled that the king's ship on the coast (from which the chest had been landed) was named the *Search*.

JOHN ROBERT MOORE

Indiana University

AN INDEBTEDNESS OF COLERIDGE TO CRASHAW

Samuel Taylor Coleridge expressed his admiration for Richard Crashaw more than once, commenting on the sweetness of the language employed by the elder poet. He praised in a general way the richness of thought and diction characteristic of Crashaw, and

cited for special comment the poems, "Hope," "Hymn to the Name of Jesus," and "A Hymne to Saint Teresa" ¹ To the last-mentioned piece he acknowledged his indebtedness for the inspiration of the undeveloped theme of "Christabel." ² It was also due to the discerning criticism of Coleridge that Crashaw regained a place of prominence among the poets after a century or more of neglect. Professor Warren points out the fact that the belief in the Incarnation held by both Wordsworth and Coleridge gave them an approach to Crashaw unavailable to the secular-minded ³

Coleridge's poem, "Coeli Enarrant," which he said was written in imitation of Du Bartas as translated by Sylvester, ⁴ contains as its principal image the threatening aspect of a "large Black Letter" in the heavens as a presage of wrath.

Turn from the portent—all is blank on high
No constellations alphabet the sky.
The Heavens one large Black Letter only shew,
And as a child beneath its master's blow
Shrills out at once its task and its affright—
The groaning world now learns to read aright,
And with its Voice of Voices cries out, O! ⁵

Du Bartas in the French original, ⁶ and Sylvester in the English paraphrase, ⁷ refer to a red letter as a page decoration and a calendar date, but in no place does either one invest it with an ominous aspect.

Crashaw, in one of his finest poems, "In the Glorious Epiphany of our Lord God," uses the striking figure of the "large black letter" in depicting the effect of the "supernatural light of thy pure day":

¹ Thomas Allsop, *Letters, Conversations, and Recollections of S. T. Coleridge* (London, 1836), I, 195-196.

² *Ibid.* See also Arthur H. Nethercot, *The Road to Tryermaine* (Chicago, 1939), pp. 26, 208-11.

³ Austin Warren, "Crashaw's Reputation in the Nineteenth Century," *PMLA.*, LI, 774

⁴ *Coleridge's Poems*, ed. E. H. Coleridge (1912), I, 486 n.

⁵ *Ibid.*, "Coeli Enarrant," lines 5-11.

⁶ Holmes, Lyons, Linker, *The Works of Du Bartas* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1938), II, 200, lines 151-162, II, 206, lines 377-384.

⁷ Joshua Sylvester, *The Divine Weeks*, ed. Theron Wilber Haight (Waukesha, Wis., 1908), pp. 3 and 11. Lines unmarked.

It was their weakness woo'd his beauty,
 But it shall be
 Their wisdom now, as well as duty,
 T'enjoy his blot, and as a large black letter,
 Use it to spell thy beauties better,
 And make the night itself their torch to Thee⁸

Although one grants that Coleridge knew what had occasioned the writing of "Coeli Enarrant," yet the similarity of the image makes the parallel seem more an echo than a chance resemblance.

SISTER EUGENIA LOGAN

*Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College,
 Indiana*

BROWNING'S "PARLEY" AND DE LASSAY'S "MÉMOIRE"

In his "Parleying with Daniel Bartoli" Browning tells a story originally recorded by the Marquis de Lassay in *Recueil de différentes choses*. Browning's source, however contrary to popular opinion, was not de Lassay's own recording of this incident in his life but that of Sainte-Beuve in *Causeries du Lundi*.

De Lassay's story begins.¹

Quelques années après la paix des Pyrénées, le duc de Lorraine vint en France, où il fit un traité avec le roi, par lequel il lui céda ses États à des conditions écrites en plusieurs endroits, trop longues pour être mises ici, et, de plus, inutiles à ce que j'ai dessein de dire. Après avoir fait ce traité, il s'en repentit et ne voulut plus qu'il eût d'exécution.

Browning opens his account with the words.

Come now! A great lord once upon a time
 Visited—oh a king, of kings the prime,
 To sign a treaty such as never was.
 For the king's minister had brought to pass

⁸ Richard Crashaw, *op. cit.*, lines 183-189.

¹ Since the original *Mémoires* of the Marquis de Lassay are not available, I have used Maurice Lange's edition of *Lettres amoureuses et pensées du Marquis de Lassay* in which the story told by Browning is given as "Récit de ce qui passa dans le moment où M. de Lorraine alla épouser Mademoiselle Marianne," pp. 51-58, cf. DeVane, William Clyde, *Browning's Parleyings; The Autobiography of a Mind*, pp. 64-67.

That this same duke—so style him—must engage
 Two of his dukedoms as a heritage
 After his death to the exorbitant
 Craver of kingship "Let who lacks go scant
 Who owns much give the more to!" Why rebuke?
 So bids the devil, so obeys the duke

The chief difference here is in Browning's words "engage two of his dukedoms" and the French words "cédait ses États." In the French version no mention is made of the number of possessions, and, too, the word "État" would hardly suggest to Browning the idea of dukedoms. Browning's authority is Sainte-Beuve, who says that the dukedoms of Lorraine and of Bar were to be ceded to the king "il lui cédait ses États après lui et l'instituait héritier de ses duchés de Lorraine et de Bar"²

While waiting for the treaty to be drawn up the duke stayed at the home of his sister, and it was there that he met Marianne, the heroine of the story. The "Mémoire" describes her as.

Une fille que sa beauté, ses graces et son esprit avaient mis dans le monde d'un air bien différent de celui qu'elle y devait avoir par sa naissance: elle s'appelait Marianne et n'était que femme de chambre de Mademoiselle. Ses qualités aimables et ses manières nobles, qui avaient plu à tout le monde, touchèrent le duc de Lorraine, qui en devint passionnément amoureux³

In the above passage no mention is made of the trade that Marianne's father followed, while Browning says:

"What, sister, may this wonder be?"
 "Nobody! Good as beautiful is she,
 With gifts that match her goodness, no faint flaw
 I' the white she wert the pearl you think you saw,
 But that she is—what corresponds to white?
 Some other stone, the true pearl's opposite,
 As cheap as pearls are costly. She's—now, guess
 Her parentage! Once—twice—thrice? Foiled, confess!
 Drugs, duke, her father deals in—faugh, the scents!"

Sainte-Beuve gave Browning the clue to the girl's parentage: "La grande Mademoiselle, chez qui le père de Marianne avait l'office

² C. A. Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, Paris, Garnier, 1869, ix, 166.

³ Lange, *op cit.*, p. 53.

d'apothécaire et qui considérait Marianne elle-même comme une de ses domestiques, a parlé d'elle avec hauteur" ⁴

The three versions of the story have similar wording in regard to the preparation for the duke's marriage to Marianne. They each tell of the part played by the minister, Tellier, in drawing up the treaty whereby the duke was to sign away his possessions effective immediately upon his marriage. The difference lies in the scene in which Tellier explains the plan to Marianne. According to the "Mémoire" he calls her aside, explains the treaty, and asks her to prevail upon the duke to sign. Instead of being pleased Marianne is disgusted at the thought of a dishonorable procedure, and she gives her answer immediately.

Marianne ne balança pas un moment, et elle répondit à M. Le Tellier qu'elle aimait beaucoup mieux demeurer Marianne que d'être Duchesse de Lorraine aux conditions qu'on lui proposait, et que, si elle avait quelque pouvoir sur l'esprit de M. de Lorraine, elle ne s'en servirait jamais pour lui faire faire une chose si contraire à son honneur et à ses intérêts ⁵

Browning has Marianne return to the banquet hall and give her answer in the presence of all the people gathered there, rather than give her answer directly to Tellier:

At the table's head

Where, mid the hushed guests, still the duke sat glued
In black bewilderment, his spouse pursued
Her speech to end.

Here, again, Sainte-Beuve is Browning's authority "et puis elle rentra dans la chambre où était la compagnie pour prendre congé de M. de Lorraine." ⁶

In bringing the story to a close Sainte-Beuve has the same account, word for word, as de Lassay, but there is a sequel to the story, and it is here that a final proof of Browning's source is found. In his sequel Browning says:

. . . that a fervid youth
Big-hearted boy,—but ten years old, in truth—
Laid this to heart and loved, as boyhood can,
The unduchessed lady boy and lad grew man. . . .
They were wed.

⁴ Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, p. 167

⁵ Lange, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

⁶ Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, p. 168

The 'ten-year-old' boy was the Marquis de Lassay. It seems hardly likely that a lad of ten would fall so profoundly in love, yet Sainte-Beuve gives the age as ten.

Lassay n'était âgé que de dix ans au moment où arriva cette aventure, et sa jeune imagination en avait été frappée, il avait eu l'occasion presque au sortir de l'enfance de rencontrer Marianne et s'était accoutumé à l'admirer, à l'aimer.⁷

On the other hand, the marquis, while brooding over the death of Marianne, recalls the past and speaks of his having been fifteen years of age at the time he met and fell in love with her "A quinze ans je l'ai connue, et à quinze ans j'ai commencé à l'aimer, depuis cette passion a toujours réglé ma vie, et il n'y a rien que je ne lui aie sacrifié."⁸

VIOLA COOK

Lynch, Kentucky

A SILLY SONNET TO ORPHEUS

"In attempting to be abysmally simple and unutterably mysterious at one and the same time, he occasionally lapsed into pure inanity: '... And the lamb's far stiller instinct's clear / When it begs us for a bell.' This may be nonsense, but it is Orphic nonsense."¹

It is true that the *Sonette an Orpheus* continue to be considered enigmatic.² However, for II, 16, there existed a full and adequate interpretation.³ It is also true that the last lines are a distinct

¹ *Ibid*

² Quoted by Lange, *op cit.*, p. 58. Browning accordingly followed Sainte-Beuve's account. If de Lassay's account had been before him, Browning would have used the correct age of fifteen instead of saying the lad was only ten.

³ E. M. Butler, *Rainer Maria Rilke* (1941), 357.

⁴ Cp. "In the Sonnets to Orpheus, even where the meaning is beyond our reach. . ." B. Fairley, "Rainer Maria Rilke: An Estimate," *Univ. Toronto Quart.* (1941-42), 7.

⁵ J. v. Freydnor, *Die Sonette an Orpheus als zyklische Dichtung* (1937), pp. 7 and 27:

"Die Wunde, die wir am Gott, am Sein aufreißen, heilt immer wieder. . . Nie öffnet sich uns ganz die Welt des Gottes—auch nicht der ihm rein, ohne Absicht geweihten Spende, wahrer Kunst. Nur der Tote kennt jene Welt, die wir vom Sein Losgerissenen und Lärmenden manchmal ahnen.

anti-climax, as are many other final verses in the *Sonette an Orpheus*. That need not be an artistic fault. But the seeming disconnectedness of the tercets (while one élan fills each of the neighbouring sonnets) and the necessity of conquering the meaning (while in most of the *Sonette an Orpheus* the meaning triumphantly conquers us) are decidedly not artistic advantages.

However, there should be no doubt that *Sonette an Orpheus* II, 16 makes sense. Think of the often-made equation *principium individuationis* = *principium iniquitatis* * or think of the intellect "disintegrating" the forces of life; or think of Nature overgrowing the scars that men have made. Rilke's first quatrain makes you aware of these several ideas.

Immer wieder von uns aufgerissen,
ist der Gott die Stelle, welche heilt
Wir sind Scharfe, denn wir wollen wissen,
aber er ist heiter und verteilt

We may even think of "original sin" in the Christian sense, but in the second quatrain is the obvious conviction that the necessary piety of man toward God corresponds to a necessary apathy of God toward man:

Selbst die reine, die geweihte Spende
nimmt er anders nicht in seine Welt,
als indem er sich dem freien Ende
unbewegt entgegenstellt

"Pure" and "consecrated" is the offering. There is no doubt about its being of the most pious kind. Perhaps the poet means his own offering. Yet how tragic is the relation of this man to God, the *religio* that binds this man and his God! The man's end of the relation is called "free" (see the tragic meaning of "free" in II, 23 and 26), the God's end "unmoved" *Entgegenstellt* is the

. Hebbel 'Aber so ist auch der Mensch, furcht ich, ein Schmerz nur in Gott' . . . Das Tier hat nicht ganz so viele eigenwillige seinsstörende Bestrebungen wie wir. Einem stilleren Instinkt als wir folgt das Lamm."

* "Sōma sōma—der antike Leib ein Grab!—war das Bekenntnis der orphischen Religion. Aischylos und Pindar haben das Dasein als Schuld begriffen. Als Frevel empfinden es die Heiligen aller Kulturen." O. Spengler, *Untergang d. Abendlandes*, II, 333 (1922, the same year as *Sonette an Orpheus*).

most plastic word for the attitude of this God. He is not with us, he is transcendental, beyond

A poem could end here. The meaning is complete, the wording lucid, the end forcible. The disconnectedness of the following tercets is due to overabundance of material. The first tercet is the gravitational center of the sonnet. It is the point which the poet wanted to make. It was only retarded by the full-grown introduction. An unbroken line leads through the surrounding sonnets

“überwinternd Herz (13)—Blumen-Geschwister (14)
—Brunnen Mund (15)—gehörte Quelle (16)
—Fruchte der Tröstung (17)—Baum aus Bewegung” (18)

Only with this tercet does Sonnet 16 take its intended place among those neighbors.⁵

Nur der Tote trinkt
aus der hier von uns gehörten Quelle,
wenn der Gott ihm schweigend winkt, dem Toten

Twice “the dead” is mentioned, he of whom the poet intended to speak. He is a higher being. In Rilke’s hierarchy he stands nearer the God than *we*. He does not disturb; he is above the *iniquitas individuationis*.

In such an exposition of his entire world-view Rilke had to give a place to his beloved animals. That accounts for the strange final tercet, shared by the man and the lamb:

Uns wird nur das Lärmen angeboten.
Und das Lamm erbittet seine Schelle
aus dem stilleren Instinkt.

Uns emphasizes once more the superficiality of the living, in con-

⁵ The image is prepared in the preceding sonnet:

O Brunnen-Mund . . . (der Erde). Nur mit sich allein
redet sie also. Schiebt ein Krug sich ein,
so scheint es ihr, daß du sie unterbrichst. (15)

In the following sonnet the transcendent realm of the dead and God becomes the dispensary of grace, or at least of *Tröstung*:

Wo, in welchen immer selig bewässerten Gärten . . .
Gibt es denn Bäume, von Engeln befliegen . . .
Haben wir niemals vermocht, wir Schatten und Schemen,
jener gelassenen Sommer Gleichmut zu stören? (17)

The image of 16 is prepared in 15, the thought is continued in 17.

trast to the God (1-8), to the dead (9-11), in contrast even to the animal (13-14). The animals with which we are in contact are not noisy enough for us, they too are, to a certain degree, "heiter und vertelt", so they let us supply them with the necessary means of noise.

Besides the connexion with its neighbors, II, 16 also shows a curious connexion with II, 11.⁶ The relation of hunter and animal (11) can be contrasted to the relation of death and man (16). There is no pity in either poem. The animals must die, and that is "was an uns selber geschieht" (11)—"wenn der Gott uns winkt" (16). The difficult last tercet of 16 is a double counterpoint on the two poems. There is a quadruple set of relations: of the lamb to its owner, of the dead one to the God, of the fountain to the human ear, of the animal to the hunter. The difficulty is that they are not parallels (not accompaniment but counterpoint). The lamb feels our bluntness of perception and agrees to be noticeable by its bell; just as the fountain has but its tinkling for us, who do not notice how the numberless dead, all the time, use it more intimately, the dead do everything in accordance to the God's silent commands—in contrast to the relation between the "weiterbezwingende Mensch" and the animals hunted (11) or raised (16).

NORBERT FUEBST

Stanford University

COUNT PHILIP'S BOOK AND THE GRAAL

Chrétien's *Conte del graal* or preferably *Perceval* begins with a eulogy of Philip of Flanders in terms of Alexander, of whose *largesse* the French poet is naturally proud. It has always intrigued me that the *Roman d'Alexandre* (Venice Version, vs. 618) is our earliest reference to OF *graal*:

Ersoir mangai o toi a ton graal—

⁶ At another place the author has attempted to explain the organism of the *Sonette an Orpheus* as a structure of twice five groups of sonnets. In such a structure our sonnet would be placed in relationship with II, 11 on the one hand, and with II, 20 on the other.

The mute fishes of II, 20 recall not only the lamb of II, 16, they are used also as another image for the beyond, the place where "der Tote trinkt":

"Aber ist nicht am Ende ein Ort, wo man das, was der Fische Sprache wäre, ohne sie spricht?" (20)

a word which the Arsenal Version, now accessible, renders innocuously by *ostal*.

But Chrétien goes on to inform us that Philip gave him the book out of which the Grail story was set to verse:

A rimouier le meillor conte
Par le comandement le conte
Qui soit contez an cort real
Ce est li contes del graal,
Dont li eucens li bailla le livre

I agree with Foerster that this particular reference to a 'book' must be taken seriously, though I differ with his opinion (cf. *MP*, 13 [1916], 682) that it contained the so-called 'first' redaction of Robert de Boron's well-known poem. Many scholars, even Hilka, thought the *livre* a Latin book, which is possible but not necessary. Whatever its language, it was one of Chrétien's sources. What did it contain? That, barring its discovery, we shall never know. One may, however, speculate on its contents, especially since A. C. L. Brown, in his recent *Origin of the Grail Legend* (Harvard Press, 1943), thinks it may have contained the "*Ur-Perceval*," which he derives ultimately from Irish sources. The circumstance that *graal*—obviously a rare word—occurred in an Alexander poem and that Chrétien compares his patron to Alexander perhaps has some bearing on the subject.

Baist, whose views are never to be scorned, says in his *Panzival und der Gral* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1909, p. 18):

Wir haben bei ihm [Chrestien] ein aus Sage und Mäthen wohl-bekanntes Motiv vor uns, die Losung eines Bannes durch eine bestimmte Frage, das richtige Wort bricht den Zauber—ohne dass dabei in der Überlieferung immer klar würde, warum gerade es das richtige ist. Die Frage wem der Gral dient [vs. 3245: *cui l'an an servoit*] stammt, nach dem Prolog zu schliessen, aus dem Buch des Grafen Philipp, die Antwort, er dient dem alten König, wird im Gedicht selbst vorweggenommen

Nevertheless, he thinks (p. 19) that the little we know about Latin writings of the time leads us to believe

dass in der Vorlage die Weishertslehren in viel engerer Beziehung zur Handlung standen als bei Chrestien. Dann aber wird es möglich, dass der Gral in seiner *ersten* Gestalt ohne jede wunderbare Eigenschaft war und nur die Regel exemplifizieren half, dass unter Umständen auch Reden Gold sei.

The last is a pregnant remark, and I regret with others that Baist did not live to elaborate it. For, if Philip's book merely described the *graal* as a precious and rare object (set in jewels see vs. 3233¹) about which any sensible man would ask, then the fact that a benighted youth does not ask would stamp him as a 'simpleton' whom experience but no amount of pedagogy could help. This rather simple explanation has the great merit of recognizing that the *Perceval* is primarily an *Erziehungsroman*, one of the earliest in French literature: the advice given the youth by his mother, the instruction by Gornemant in chivalry, the corrections thrust on him by the hermit—all prove that to be true. Need I recall that this is the same Chrétien who, in *Cligés* (vss 31-44) wedded *clergie*, which is 'learning,' to *chevalerie*, which is a 'way of life,' and, anticipating the Renaissance, traced them both back to Greece and Rome? Thus, of all the manifold attempts to explain the *livre* (and I made a guess at it myself, *Elthott Studies*, I, 39), I believe Baist's is the most plausible, on the basis of the little evidence we possess. Let us not forget that Philip was an educated and travelled man (see the commentary in Hilka's edition, p. 616, and by Helen Adolph, *PMLA*, LIII [1943], 597 ff.) and that about 1175 an unknown protégé of his prepared the famous collection of *Li pro-verbe au vilain*—a collection on which Chrétien himself probably drew (*MLN*, 46 [1941], 408).

What then about the poet's Celtic sources? They remain largely as Nutt, Vendryes, Brown, Loomis, and others have established. The *Roi Pescheor* is certainly the French equivalent for the Irish *Nuadu* (or *Nuadha*) and the Welsh *Nudd*, the Grail palace reflects an actual Celtic setting, the food-giving, magic quality given the *graal* by Chrétien is Celtic, as are many of the subsidiary traits and characters in the story. On this Brown's treatise can be consulted with profit. But, I think, Baist was right when he appraised Chrétien in the words.

Er liebt es, seine Wunder in hellster Beleuchtung hervortreten, aber

¹ Helinand's (see *MP*, 13 [1916], 681) explanation of *gradalis* by *gradatim* and of *graal* by *grata et acceptabilis* is medieval etymologizing, but he does say that it is a *scutella lata et aliquantulum profunda in qua preciosae dapes duntibus solent apponi*. I add Chrétien's own description:

De fin or esmeré estoit,
Pierres precieuses avoit
El graal de maintes manieres.

dann verdammen zu lassen Ihr Endzweck ist die Verherrlichung des Rittertums, und sie verschwinden, sobald dies Ziel erreicht ist Die zweite Frage warum die Lanze blutet, ist für die Percevalfabel überflüssig, aber Chrétien braucht die Lanze für seine Absicht, am Schluss Gawain mit Perceval zusammenzuführen und der getrennten Handlung ein gemeinsames Ziel zu geben

It is significant that Robert de Boron never mentions the lance, and Buidach's attempt (see *MP*, 37 [1940], 315 ff) to connect it with Byzantine ritual must be considered a failure. What Baist himself failed to grasp is that the material which Chrétien, in his masterly way, wove about Philip's *grail* came from Celtic sources, the Welsh and Breton stories with which he was acquainted The time is ripe for some Romance scholar to collaborate with a Celticist in a book on Chrétien's last romance.²

WILLIAM A. NITZE

*University of California
at Los Angeles*

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF "R GRASSEYÉ"

Repeated observation of the substituting of trilled apical *r* by a fricative apical *r*, in Mexico, suggests an explanation for the evolution of *r*, in France, from trilled apical *r* to a fricative uvular *r*. This fricative *r* is the one used most generally by the present French generation. It shows almost complete loss of uvular trills (except for emphasis, or in some provinces such as Vivarais). Its point of articulation is in the region of the uvula and the back or more precisely the root of the tongue. It has been called "dorsal" in recent descriptions¹ because, as the uvula does not vibrate, the part played by the back of the tongue is felt more. But the constriction which causes the friction noise when the breath goes through is still in the same region as when the uvula vibrated regularly, that is, toward the upper pharynx and the very root of the tongue. It is more correct to speak of the root of the tongue than

¹ I understand that Professor Spitzer is about to publish a new etymology of the word *grail*.

² Maurice Grammont, *Traité pratique de prononciation française*, Paris, Delagrave, 1933, 9e édition, p. 67.

of its back. The back implies that the point of articulation has been brought slightly forward from the uvular region, as in the case of Haitian French where the fricative *r* is almost similar to the Spanish fricative *g* of intervocal position (*haga*). This is not at all the case in Parisian French where the tendency is on the contrary for the point of articulation to draw farther back, producing friction and resonance by constriction of the very muscles of the pharynx. It is this pharyngeal resonance which gives it its character "gras," whence the expression "*r grasseyé*."

In Mexico, we have often heard cultivated people as well as others use a fricative apical *r*. The intended sound was a trilled (multiple-vibration) *r*, but the vibration of the tip of the tongue, functioning as an elastic organ, failed to get a start, and the result was a mere constriction between the tongue tip and the alveolar ridge at a point between those of [z] and [ʒ]. Naturally, the fricative sound resembles both [z] and [ʒ], and would simply be an intermediary sound of these, were it not for the fact that the aperture is greater, the tongue tip more raised and much more tense, and the sound is held longer. (This change from trilled apical *r* to fricative apical *r* obviously recalls the French change from [r] to [z], as in *chaise* for *chaire*, *besicle* for *bericle*, *Gesainville* for *Gerainville*. However, the Mexican change is only phonetic, while the French change became *phonemic*.) Navarro Tomás describes several defective *r* sounds of Spain and Spanish speaking countries. They come from both flapped *r* and trilled *r*; and are found in various positions: intervocal, initial, and postconsonantal. In naming them, he distinguishes the fricative *r* from the assibilated *r*.² From his descriptions, all these defective *r* sounds seem to be related to the fricative *r* we heard in Mexico. But our Mexican fricative *r* came only from a trilled *r* and not from a flapped *r*. Therefore, we clearly noted it only in the following positions: initial (*rico*), after *l*, *n*, *s* (*Enrique*), intervocal (*torre*), and rarely final (*vivir*).

The history of modern French *r* must have taken place in two phases. In the first phase, uvular trilled *r* coexisted with and gradually replaced apical trilled *r*. The two sounds can belong to the same phoneme. Their coexistence under one phoneme is a

² Navarro Tomás, *Manuel de pronunciación española*, Madrid, 1932, cuarta edición, pp. 117-118, 120, 122, 123-124.

common phenomenon in many dialectal forms of both Germanic and Romanic languages today. The nearest example for us can be found in the Spanish of Puerto Rico, where trilled *r* is a strongly vibrated *r* from the uvula. Only a trained ear can distinguish it from an apical trilled *r*. In the second phase, the uvular trilled *r* became a fricative *r* without changing its point of articulation. The vibrating of the uvula failed to get a start, and the only sound produced was a voiced friction caused by the running of the breath through the constriction.

This second phase is the one that was suggested to us by the existence of a fricative apical *r* in Mexico. The first phase needs to have occurred only if the second is correct.

Those two phases were necessary to satisfy the French tendency to vocalic anticipation: during the French articulation of the consonant, the tongue always tries to take the position of the following vowel, thereby eliminating diphthongization. This vocalic anticipation requires as much freedom of the tongue as possible. With the apical *r* keeping the tip of the tongue occupied, the vowel position could not be anticipated and a transitory movement from *r* to the following vowel was inevitable. The change from apical to uvular *r* was a first step to liberate the tongue; then the change from trilled to fricative *r* completed the liberation of the tongue, allowing it to articulate the *r* while holding in advance the position of the following vowel.

We might even go farther back in our investigation of the "pourquoi" and notice that the French tendency to vocalic anticipation is in line with the characteristic of *clarié* which is manifested in all other branches of the French language as well as in its phonetics. A predilection for clearness may be the dominant psychological factor in the phonetic evolution of French to its present form.

PIERRE DELATRE

University of Oklahoma

NINCOMPOOP

Mr. M L Radoff, *PQ*, x, 312 has proposed an etymology for *nincompoop* to which nothing can be objected the expression *nic à poux*, a hapax in Fr which appears in Larivey's comedy *Les jaloux* of 1579 as an insult against a certain captain, the original meaning would be 'nest of lice, hence 'lousy fellow,' 'simpleton' The earliest attestations in English (1676, 1685) show a form without nasal (*ncompoop*, *nackompoop*), the form with *n*-occurring only in 1706; this is a circumstance which would back Mr. Radoff's etymology One might only remark that Mr. Radoff is forced to bring in a popular etymology (an alteration by the quite different word *poop*), and that from 'lousy fellow' we might rather expect, perhaps, such semantic developments as 'scoundrel,' 'prostitute' etc. than 'feeble-minded.'

Nevertheless, I submit another etymology, which seems to me more plausible—and, *in rebus etymologicis*, the 'more plausible' must be preferred to a solution whose only claim is that there is 'nothing against it'

Anyone who is aware of the number of French (and especially Western French) dialectal words surviving in English, which have not yet been recognized as such, will probably concur in my opinion that the following Anjou words are at the root of *nincompoop* (cf. the dictionary of Verrier-Onillon, 1908).

hippopombe, *hippoponte* 'sans énergie, impotent'

impopompe, *impondre* 'gauche, maladroit, balourd; maladroit de ses mains'

ipondre 'hypocondriaque, paralytique,' 'maladroit, inactif' ('t'es là comme un *ipondre*')

Alongside all these deformations of Fr *hypocondre* (deformations due to the weak pronunciation of -r after cons. in popular French: **ipocond'*. **ipocond* > **ipopont* > **ipopomp* > **impopomp* and, perhaps, to an influence of *hippopotame*¹) we must assume an

¹ The adjective *hypocondre* is first attested in French with Régner (end of the 16th c.), and *hippopotame* in the 13th century (*ypotame* [sic!] in Brunetto Latini).

A similar contamination with a popular word occurs in Italian dialects: *kokombria* 'hypocondria' (+ *ambria* 'suspicion'), v. Prati, *A. Gl. It.*, xvii, 405.

**i(m)pocomp* (> *hypocondrie* + *-omp* ending) which underwent the metathesis **i(m)compoop*, and was furnished with the *-n* of the French or English indefinite article. The semantic development is of the kind to be expected when technical terms of the medical profession (*hypocondrie*, *hypocondriaque* are attested as such as early as the 16th century) become popular ('weak, awkward' > 'mentally weak, awkward'). By the date of appearance of the English word, that of the popular deformations of *hypocondrie* in Western France, as listed by Vernier-Onillon, is automatically pushed back several centuries.

In English, the word *nincom[poop]* was susceptible to the influence of *income*. Partridge's *Dict. of Slang* lists *nuncum-noodle* "a noodle with no income" jocular London ca. 1820-40. The same association appears in a sketch by Arthur Kober published in the *New Yorker* (Nov. 4, 1944), which reproduces the speech of a Hollywood theatrical agent who has the habit of distorting words usually by giving them a commercial implication. In this speaker's mind the word *n]incompoop* is associated with *income* (just as 'King Midas' becomes with him 'King Minus'). "Why do you take it [abuse from the movie star you are representing]?—'Why? Because I'm a first-class *incomepoop* [sic!], that's why. Some guys, they are born lucky like King Minus, whereby the lease thing they touch turns right away to gold. But not this here party.'" I would not be so bold as to suggest that in this *incom(e)poop* we have the original form borrowed from dial. Fr. *impopompe*, minus the agglutination of the *n-* of the indefinite article; rather, *incomepoop* is probably due to a new 'deglutination': *a nincompoop* > *an incompoop*—which, by accident, has gone back to the original form and to the French etymon.

LEO SPITZER

A popular caricature of the hypochondriac, which comes very close to the picture of a *nincompoop*, must underlie the description given by Diderot's 'neveu de Rameau':

"Mon hypocondre, la tête renfoncée dans un bonnet de nuit qui lui couvre les yeux, a l'air d'une pagode immobile à laquelle on aurait attaché un fil au menton, d'où il descendrait jusque sous son fauteuil. . . . Il s'était placé dans une chaise, la tête fixe, le chapeau jusque sur les paupières, les yeux demi clos, remuant sa mâchoire comme un automate. . . ."

STRINDBERG'S 'FADREN' AND THE THÉÂTRE LIBRE

Strindberg's *Fadren*, written in 1887,¹ had its world première in Copenhagen on November 14, 1887, and its Stockholm première on January 12, 1888.² By direct statement as well as by implication, certain American and Swedish writers would have us believe that this play was also produced at the Théâtre Libre in Paris in 1887 or 1888.³

A search of materials fails to produce any evidence in support of the statement that *Fadren* was produced in Paris in the eighties in any theatre or that it was given at the Théâtre Libre at any time. Strindberg himself makes no such claim, indicating that the play was given at l'Œuvre in Paris during the nineties,⁴ but it is possible that some readers have misinterpreted a passage in which Strindberg associates the plays *Froken Julie*, *Fadren*, and *Fördringsagare* with the Théâtre Libre, l'Œuvre, and the Freie Bühne.⁵ One unacquainted with the facts might assume that all three plays were performed in each of the theatres. Yet Adolphe Thalasso's book on the Théâtre Libre has been available since 1909, and André Antoine has also published his books on the Parisian stage.⁶ In none of them is there any reference to *Fadren* in rela-

¹ Strindberg, *Samlade skrifter* (Stockholm, 1921), xxiii, 422, Martin Lamm, *August Strindberg* (Stockholm, 1940), I, 329.

² Y. Hedvall, *Strindberg på Stockholmsscenen, 1870-1922* (Stockholm, 1923), p. 62.

³ L. Lind-af-Hageby, *August Strindberg, the Spirit of Revolt* (New York, 1913), p. 172, Thomas H. Dickinson, *Chief Contemporary Dramatists* (First Series, Boston, 1915), p. 667, Burns Mantle and John Gassner, *A Treasury of the Theatre* (New York, 1935), p. 800, George Freedley and John A. Reeves, *A History of the Theatre* (New York, 1941), p. 386, Donald Clive Stuart, *The Development of Dramatic Art* (New York, 1928), p. 636, Frank W. Chandler, *Modern Continental Playwrights* (New York, 1931), p. 37, Henrik Schuck och Karl Warburg, editors, *Illustrerad svensk litteraturhistoria*, 3 upplagan, Vol. VII. *Den nya tiden*, av Gunnar Castrén (Stockholm, 1932), p. 128, Lamm, *op cit*, p. 344; Lamm, *Strindbergs dramer* (Stockholm, 1924), I, 301; Nils Erdmann, *August Strindberg* (tr. from the Swedish, Leipzig, 1924), p. 581.

⁴ *Samlade skrifter* (Stockholm, 1919), I, 47.

⁵ *Ibid* (Stockholm, 1923), xix, 148.

⁶ Thalasso, *Le Théâtre Libre* (Paris, 1909), Antoine, *Mes souvenirs sur le Théâtre Libre* (Paris, 1921), *Mes souvenirs sur le Théâtre Antoine et sur l'Odéon* (Paris, 1928), *Le théâtre* (Paris, 1932).

tion to the Théâtre Libre. Indeed, despite the presence of materials for error,⁷ the facts were at hand.

Thalasso says that Strindberg's first production in France was the performance of *Froken Julie* at the Théâtre Libre on January 16, 1893,⁸ and Antoine confirms the date and the place.⁹ Again, French authorities are in agreement that *Fadren* was first given in Paris at the Théâtre de l'Œuvre, December 13, 1894, under the direction of Lugné-Poe.¹⁰

CARL E. W. L. DAHLSTROM

University of Michigan

SOME FURTHER CHAUCER ALLUSIONS

The following Chaucer allusions have not, I think, been noted in any collection.

1. *Lady Almony or, The Almony Lady. An Excellent Pleasant New Comedy* . . London, 1659, Sig. D: Cave:

. . . ne're was woman matcht
To such a stupid, sottish animal;
One that's compos'd of Non-sense, and so weak
In Masculine abilities, he ne're read
The Wife of Bathes Tale, . . .

2. Crosse, Henry. *Vertues Common-wealth* . . . London, 1603. Sig. P Under the heading "Many Poets Shallow Wits," Crosse remarks that their verse is

⁷ Various *Père* plays have been given on the Parisian stage, one of them in 1887. Cf. Antoine, *Mes souvenirs sur le Théâtre Libre*, p. 213, *Le théâtre*, pp. 73, 200; Gabriel Randon, "Les Escholiers," *Mercure de France*, XI (June, 1894), 174.

⁸ Thalasso, *op. cit.*, pp. 103, 133, 253, 274, 279.

⁹ Antoine, *Mes souvenirs sur le Théâtre-Libre*, pp. 286-287; *Le théâtre*, p. 293.

¹⁰ Antoine, *Le théâtre*, p. 312; Henri Albert, "*Père*," *Mercur de France*, Vol. XIII (Jan., 1895), 103-107; Francisque Sarcey, *Quarante ans de théâtre* (Paris, 1902), VIII, 400-407; Jules Lemaitre, *Impressions de théâtre* (Paris, n. d.), IX, 103-110. Cf. also Hedvall, *op. cit.*, p. 66; Frida Strindberg, *Strindberg och hans andra hustru* (Stockholm, 1934), II, 374, 383, 392.

Farre from the decorum of *Chausser*, *Gowers*, *Lidgate*, &c or our honourable moderne Poets, who are no whit to be touched with this, but reverently esteemed, and liberally rewarded

3 Gee, John *The Foot out of the Snare*. London, 1624, p. 30.

I beleue, many houses in England, haue beene much haunted with sprites, not of the kinde of *Fairies*, but of those of whom ingenuous *Chaucer* speaketh, that where the *Limier Exorcising Priest* went vp and downe, within his station, there were no diuels nor Hobgoblins to molest, especially the weaker sex in the night time, the reason he giues is demonstratue For See,

There n' is none other Incubus but hee

4. *Sir Gyles Goosecappe Knight A Comedie*. . London, 1606, Sig. E2.

Foul The Lord Tales, what countriman is hee?

Ia A kentish Lord Sir, his auncestours came forth
off Canterburie

Foul Out of Canterburie

Will I indeede Sir the best Tales in England are
your Canterburie *Tales*, I assure ye

Rud The boy tels thee true Captaine

5. Head, Richard and Francis Kirkman. *The English Rogue. Part III*. 1674. (Reprinted, 1874), p. 119.

"... the maid tells how that these two old men had been telling their *Canterbury tales* so long that the pot was melted, "

6. Howell, T. B. *State Trials* 1812 I, col. 1046. Trial of Robert Hickford (secretary to the Duke of Norfolk) Feb. 9, 1571. Lord Chief Justice Catline said:

As for them that seeke fame by Treason where shall sound that fame?
Shall the Golden Trump of Fame and Good Report, that *Chaucer* speaketh of? No, .

7. *Catalogue of the Library of John Lord Lumley (1534²-1609)*. MS. O.4.38., Trinity College, Cambridge. (Photostat copy, Henry E. Huntington Library). "Historical. C in folio.

Chawcers woorkes anglisc̃e Jeffreie Chawcers Cantorburie tales, ouldē
written with his retractation, manuscript."

8. Malynes, Gerrard De. *Saint George for England, Allegorically described*: . . . London, 1601. Sig. B:

Aprill hauing with his sweete showers moystened the drought of March,
bathing euery veine of the rootes of trees & ingendring floures, *Zepherus*
with his pleasaunt breath prouoking tender crops by vertue of young
Phebus, holding her course in *Aries*

9. [Willis, John]. *The Art of Stenographie, Teaching by plaine
and certayne Rules*. . . London, 1602. Sig. D4. Book II, ch. 1.
(Quotes twice from Chaucer.

It is an honour to suffer rebuke for well doing That is not thine owne,
which fortune can take away

And thou Melpomene helpen to indite
These woefull lines that weepen as I
write

Chaucer

When Fayth fayles in Priestes sawes,
And Lordes hestes are holden for lawes.
And Robberie is holden purchase,
And Lecherie is holden solace:
Then shall the lond of Albioun,
Be brought to great confusioun.

Chaucer.

10. Vaughan, Sir William *The Golden Pleece*. London, 1626.

"Scotus the Master of subtil Questions conuents Sir Geoffrey Chaucer for
calling the Pope Antichrist, and comparing the Romish Church to the
gripping Griffon, and the true Church to the tender Pellican." (Pt. I, ch.
xiv, pp. 110-121.)

"Sir Geoffrey Chaucer being prouoked by Scotus to defend his Cause, proues
the Pope to bee the great and vniuersall Antichrist prophesied in the Scrip-
tures." (Ch. xv, pp. 121-31.)

"Apolloes iudgement of Chaucers Apologie concluding that the Pope is the
great Antichrist" (Ch. xvi, pp. 131-37)

[Arguments, pp 112-21, are based on the "Ploughman's Tale"
which is quoted].

————— *The Newlanders Cure*. London, 1630. Pt. II, Sec.
8, Sig. K2:

Well may *Isdraes Eagle* muster;
And bold *Chaucers Griffon* bluster.

DOROTHY F. ATKINSON

Mills College

A NOTE ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF *SHAMELA*

As a contribution to the vexed and as yet incompletely settled question of the authorship of *Shamela* (1741) may I offer the following parallel passage in Fielding's translation of Molière's *Le Médecin malgré lui* as *The Mock Doctor* or, *The Dumb Lady Cur'd* (1732). It occurs in an added plot scene which is not found in Molière's original.

Dorcas is exulting over the fact that she is at last to be revenged upon her husband for the frequent beatings he has been administering to her.

I don't remember my Heart has gone so pit-a-pat with Joy a long while.—Revenge is surely the most delicious Morsel the Devil ever dropt into the Mouth of a Woman¹

The parallel passage in *Shamela* occurs in a scene during which Shamela becomes enraged because Mrs Jewkes has upbraided her for putting Squire Booby in a "pet" during which he thrashed two or three of his men. Shamela says:

Harkee, Madam, says I, don't you affront me, for if you do, d—m me (I am sure I have repented for using such a Word) if I am not revenged.

*How sweet is Revenge Sure the Sermon Book is in the Right, in calling it sweetest Morsel the Devil ever dropped into the Mouth of a Sinner*²

This parallelism might be merely independent use by two authors of a proverbial expression, yet I find no record of the phrase in any of the more accessible collections of familiar phrases and proverbs.

CHARLES RICHARD GREENE

University of California at Los Angeles

¹ Henry Fielding, *Works*, London, A. Millar, 1755, three vols, vol. II, *The Mock Doctor*, p. 11.

² *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*, ed. Brian W. Downs, Cambridge, 1930, p. 35.

A NOTE ON KEATS AND ADDISON

Keats ended his letter of September 21, 1819, to J. H. Reynolds, with the quotation, "You'll pardon me for being jocular." So far as I am aware no one has commented on Keats's source. He alluded here to Addison's play *The Drummer*, in which the steward Vellum makes this remark on three occasions (Acts II, IV, and V). That this play had impressed Keats is made doubly certain by his earlier reference to "Master Vellum" in his letter to Leigh Hunt of May 10, 1817. Since there is no evidence that Keats re-read the play in the months between these allusions, one may perhaps see here another instance of his remarkable memory for phrases that pleased him.

H. E. BRIGGS

University of Minnesota

REVIEWS

From Art to Theatre. Form and Convention in the Renaissance.

By GEORGE R. KERNODLE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1944). Pp. x + 255. \$5.00.

This is an important work for anyone who is concerned with the development of European stage decoration, more especially with that of Italy, Spain, France, Flanders, and England. It discusses in detail the origins and interrelations of the leading Renaissance theaters, the survival of Greek and medieval usage, the history of perspective, the substitution of illusionist for symbolic decorations, the very considerable influence of *tableaux vivants*, employed for royal entries, of painting, sculpture, and other arts upon that of the stage decorator. Enlightening sections are devoted to the arcade screen, the proscenium frame, and the various spectacular ornaments used in tapestries, stained glass, painting, sculpture, illumination, etc. The general doctrine is summed up on p. 52:

Of the many new theatres of the sixteenth century, one only—the Italian perspective stage—stemmed directly from painting; and only one—the Paris Hôtel de Bourgogne—was derived directly from the medieval religious stages. All the rest owe their forms and conventions to the tradition of the visual arts by way of the street theatres.

This is, as the rest of the book shows, too great a simplification, for there were all sorts of cross-currents, but the main contention seems to me eminently sound. The evidence is clearly submitted and extensively illustrated. The work is excellently printed, in quarto format and in double columns. The author's feeling for art shows itself in the presentation of his book.

I would take issue with him only in regard to a few details. After mentioning many works that preceded his own, he makes the observation (p. 3) that "all these studies have fallen short of the mark because they have been too limited." His own study at times fails in the same way because he has not sufficiently considered the force of literary tradition. "Most historians," he asserts (p. 204), "have surveyed the controversy over the unities without realizing that it grew directly out of the conflicts in theatre conventions of the time." Undoubtedly the development of the perspective stage, with the requirement that the whole decoration be seen from one point of view, helped develop the demand for unity of place, but one must also take into consideration the example of ancient texts and the rationalistic spirit of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The unities of time and action were affected little by the way the stage was set. Even the place might meet the requirements of the artist without satisfying the critic. Failure to recognize this fact induced K. to say (p. 209) that d'Aubignac would have allowed in the same play "scenes representing France and Denmark," if they were shown in succession, but d'Aubignac would have been horrified at such an interpretation of his words. He does, indeed, allow startling changes in the appearance of the stage, but he insists that the place must remain the same, that, once the "terrain" to be represented has been selected, "il le faut supposer immobile dans tout le reste du Poeme, comme il l'est en effet."¹

Such misunderstanding, however, detracts little from the work, which makes a valuable supplement to what has been previously written about the stage.²

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

¹ Cf. d'Aubignac's *Pratique du théâtre*, Martino edition, Paris, E. Champion, 1927, p. 102.

² P. 69, for Ibram read Abiram; p. 166, for Coussin read Caussin; pp. 204-5, for 1636 read 1634 (the terminal date of 1636 is due to the mistaken identification of Rampale's *Bélinda* as Corneille's *Illusion comique*); p. 207, K. would have found evidence that the stage of the Hôtel de Bourgogne sloped, if he had consulted Jean Lemoine, *La première du Ord*, Paris, Hachette, 1936 (when the stage was rebuilt in 1647, it was raised to six feet in front and in the rear "à proportion du devant"; this indicates that the front and rear were not the same height); p. 209, Scudéry did not necessarily object to "the presence of other mansions," for all he demanded was that it should be clear in what mansion each part of the action took place.

Petrarch and the Renaissance. By J. H. WHITFIELD Oxford
Basil Blackwell, 1943. Pp 170

It is the thesis of this book that Petrarch made a greater contribution to our history than certain modern historians have wanted to recognize. The author has therefore attempted a fresh evaluation of him and of certain of his successors in the tradition of humanism (Coluccio, Bruni, Piccolomini, Valla and Vitruvius). He contends that Monnier and Burckhardt, Symonds and De Sanctis, among others, either failed to perceive the genuine values which Petrarch restored or recreated in the Renaissance or that they put those values in an unjust, unfavorable light. Petrarch was not a man of mere words and empty imitated forms, nor was the restored humanism of his time for which he was so largely responsible an evil thing, contributing to the tyrant state. Instead, that humanism is the great door of escape from the Middle Ages, pushed open by Petrarch and leading to a Machiavelli and a Voltaire and Enlightenment. Man learns again to study and understand human society and himself and his own betterment on this earth through virtue and knowledge. "Petrarch first established the social ideal of virtue" and the fifteenth century follows his lead. The second half of the study is devoted to the support of this latter statement.

Mr. Whitfield knows his Petrarch. He seems to be at home with any and all of his works. He not only knows him, he loves him. And there is a positive value to his study in the end, I believe, in that fact alone.

But Mr. Whitfield hates the Middle Ages and that hatred seems to be inseparable from his love for Petrarch. In fact he claims Petrarch really for his own only when he can find him clean of medieval contamination (which is admittedly not always). Petrarch is great for Mr. Whitfield only when he looks forward toward the future. His measure is taken in this respect not only in the works in Latin (including, of course, the Letters) but in the *Rime Sparse* as well. The following passage on the *Canzoniere* will give some idea of the way that work fits into the terms of such a judgment:

Even the famous *canzone* to the Virgin is unechoed in his letters and Petrarch's appeal here is invariably to Christ, never to the Madonna and the saints. In fact, it is unprepared for in the *Rime* themselves, and not only comes after the genuine close to Petrarch's theme, but even may seem to contrast with this. The three sonnets which immediately precede the *Canzone alla Vergine*, and in especial the last of these, are the real ending to the *Rime*; and the contradiction between the sonnet CCCLXV and the *Canzone* is an encouragement to those who have ventured to see coldness and artificiality in this celebrated composition. For the rest, the superstitions of the medieval mind find no echo, but only an opposition. (p. 43).

After such words as these it will surprise no one to learn that for Mr. Whitfield Dante is hopelessly medieval. Boccaccio too for that matter:

But if it is possible to link Petrarch, the acknowledged father of humanism, with Machiavelli, proclaimed generally as a realist, it is through this changed vision of antiquity. To those who may still object to the danger of the link, asserting that Machiavelli, and the Renaissance with him, has forgotten the medieval God, I will reply that in the works of Machiavelli the name of God is never taken in vain. In the Italian works of the medieval Boccaccio the name of God is always taken in vain (p. 42).

The picture of the Middle Ages is a very dark one indeed. It is a time of *spernere mundum* without relief, of a Fra Jacopone, for example, hanging up the *coratella* he had desired in his cell until their stench had killed his desire for meat. Or to take another kind of example, Mr. Whitfield finds no true friendship between men in the Middle Ages.

But unless I am mistaken the conception and the achievement of friendship is deficient in the Middle Ages. The reason for this is implicit in every commonplace which I have so far applied to that period without the restoration of moral philosophy the Ciceronian, and the Petrarchan, conception of friendship is impossible. The first step from a medieval to a civilised society lies in this re-establishment of the link between man and man by means of ideas and reflection (p. 63).

I choose such passages quite at random, but they are fair in representing the appalling fault of this book, and they require, I think, no comment, but pronounce their own judgment upon it. The trouble is that Mr. Whitfield could not love his Petrarch without hating a whole period of history. In fact it seems clear in the end that he has loved Petrarch *because* he despises the Middle Ages (See "the first step from a medieval to a civilized society" above). This being the case he has not been able to write history. We find ourselves driven back upon Burckhardt and De Sanctis and Saintsbury by his attack. And it is a great pity, for we had learned to be uneasy with them too when they wrote of Petrarch.

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English. By JOHN SAMUEL KENYON and THOMAS ALBERT KNOTT. Springfield, Mass.: G & C. Merriam Company, 1944. Pp. lii, 484.

The present volume seeks to do for the several—not too well defined—types of American colloquial pronunciation what Daniel Jones did twenty-seven years ago for the 'Received Pronunciation' of Southern England with his *English Pronouncing Dictionary* (London, 1917), the first of its kind.

Having acknowledged their debt to Jones, the editors of the present volume—whose names are too well known to need any

introduction—proceed to define in detail what is their aim with the book, and to what extent their practice differs from that of other dictionaries giving the pronunciation. It would lead too far to enumerate this in detail, but, briefly stated, the book may be considered a complement to *Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition*, on the staff of which both the editors have served. Whereas that dictionary tries to give 'formal platform speech' the present dictionary aims to give 'easy English,' the 'speech of well-bred ease,' not slovenly or careless speech, and of course not all the forms of the words that occur in easy connected speech.

The types of American pronunciation given are mainly the three large groups—the East (E), the South (S), and the North (N), which by some scholars is termed General American, since it is by far the largest group of the three. Of these types the editors feel most diffident about the Southern owing to a lack of sufficient evidence. It was the aim of the editors, we are told, to include Canadian as well, but here an even greater scantiness of material forced them to rest content with occasional references only.

In the excellent introduction the editors discuss the style of speech represented, the phonetical alphabet (IPA), stress, length of vowels, single and double consonants, and the ordering of variant pronunciations, giving directions for use of the dictionary. After that they discuss variants, spelling pronunciation, dissimilation, anglicizing (of foreign words), and pronunciation of Latin words, and at the end they give some miscellaneous suggestions, which a student will do well to consult.

If the editors mention the number of words included, I have overlooked it, but I should think it would be well over 45,000 (Jones has 50,290). The vocabulary is intended to include 'the great body of common words in use in America,' and, besides that, a number of American proper names, some foreign names, as well as some British personal and place names. These names are selected with an eye to the needs of college students as well as to the need of the general public, their inclusion is an excellent feature of the work.

To a native phonetician the lists of variants would offer good opportunity for comment. The reviewer, being a foreigner, does not feel competent to undertake this task. Besides, such stray observations as he might make would probably be more fit for the *Linguistic Atlas* than for a dictionary of this type. But a few remarks on the use of the IPA might, perhaps, not be amiss.

One should first of all note that where Daniel Jones uses the symbols [e], [ei] these editors use [ɛ], [e], as in *met* [met], *mate* [me-t]. The substitution of (short) [ɛ] for [e] is decidedly an improvement. The editors explain that (long) [e] stands for a vowel fluctuating regionally between the monophthong [e] and the

diphthong [eɪ] This is of course true, but when the editors use the same [e] for the close type of *e* in French and German (*e. g. abbé* ['æbe, æ'be (Fr a'be)]), they are doing nothing to dispel the universal mispronunciation among American students of such sounds in French and German. I doubt whether the simple American [e] ever has the same timbre as the French and German [e]. A distinction might have been made by a notation American [ɛ], [e¹], British [eɪ], French and German [e]. This would have called for a similar notation of American [ɔ], [o^u], British [ou], French and German [o]. As it is, the dictionary has [ɔ], [o] only, corresponding to Jones' [ɔ], [ou].

I must admit that this comes very near to quibbling. Yet it would have been desirable to indicate the difference somehow in a book that gives foreign pronunciations as often as this one does.

But I shall offer no apologies for the following. From a foreigner's point of view it is very disappointing that there should be no discrimination made between ordinary *t* in *butt*, *in-ter* and the slurred American variant in *butter*, *inter-*. Whoever compares the *t*'s in *interstate* cannot fail to observe that the first one is far weaker than the two following. My impression is that in normal colloquial American English the *t*'s in *inter-*, *plenty* are always voiced (= *d*?) and often altogether lost, or at any rate so weakened as to be almost inaudible. The same is true of *t* in *butter*, except that it is not lost, as *t* so often is after *n*.

These *t*'s might have been written in small type above the line or marked in some other way. At any rate they should have been discussed in the introduction, where, however, I find no mention of them (the peculiarity should have been mentioned in § 115). Apparently this is such an obvious member of the *t*-phoneme to native Americans, that the phoneticians do not even mention it! There is no distinction in notation between this dictionary and that of Jones, in spite of the fact that the British still say their *water* and *butter* in a way that few Americans would do.

My own experience is probably typical for the foreigner. Entering a drugstore or a restaurant here in Baltimore, I can hardly ever order *buttermilk* without repeating the word two or three times. Otherwise people have no difficulties in identifying my *t*'s, in spite of their Icelandic articulation.

I would not like to conclude without giving thanks to the publishers and the editors alike for the fine work that they have produced. It will probably long hold its place as an indispensable handbook on American English pronunciation, both for natives and foreigners.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

Milton's Royalism A Study of the Conflict of Symbol and Idea in the Poems By MALCOLM MACKENZIE ROSS Ithaca, N. Y. Cornell University Press, 1943. Pp. xiii + 150 \$2.50 (Cornell Studies in English, xxxiv.)

Milton—as Mr. Ross presents him—was the “victim of what the sociologists call ‘the cultural lag’—the persistence of literary and aesthetic values in a social milieu which now contradicted them” (p. viii). Writing in an age of political revolution, the poet consciously employed an anachronistic, Elizabethan heritage of royalist symbols—crowns, sceptres, etc.—all suited to his anti-royalist views. As a result, meaning clashed with means of expression, and *Paradise Lost* reveals a “not” of poetic confusion that Milton recognized but could not resolve until *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*. Such, in brief, is the thesis of *Milton's Royalism*.

Those who defend the artistic integrity of *Paradise Lost* will maintain that in seeking to prove his case, Mr. Ross is too quick to argue from silence (pp. 62, 68, 96, 134), too ready to generalize, too willing to emphasize one bit of evidence while he minimizes another or ignores it completely. For instance, the contrast between Milton's treatment of heaven in the minor poems and in *Paradise Lost* is not so clear cut and pronounced as Mr. Ross would have us believe (pp. 75-76, 96). If it were, then he would not find it necessary to minimize the invocation of *PL*, III (p. 109) or to ignore lines like *PL*, II, 1034-35, III, 375, v, 598-99. Mr. Ross, likewise tells us that God in *Paradise Lost* is an “utter and absolute despot” (p. 76), and that Milton during the 1610's and 1650's became increasingly pessimistic and aristocratic in his outlook (pp. 40, 59, 85, 89, 92). Yet Mr. Ross does not harmonize these statements with *PL*, III, 132-34, with the part played by Books v-viii in the epic, or with the fact that during these same years, Milton shifted from a Calvinistic to an Arminian theory of predestination that posited a God more gracious and merciful than that of Calvin, and put the opportunity of election within the grasp of every man, great or small. In fact several of Mr. Ross's remarks¹ suggest that he is not aware of this fundamental drift of doctrine. If such is the case, and Mr. Ross comprehends neither the basic argument of the epic nor the more subtle implications of the Christian tradition²

¹ See, for instance, “*Paradise Lost* with its rigorous theology of election, its denial to the masses of men of that ‘Paradise Within’” (pp. 78-79); “Milton's basic and unchangeable theology of the Elect” (p. 82); “his aristocratic Elect, the brands plucked from the burning” (p. 101); “the Presbyterian virtues of obedience and temperance” (p. 85); “His aristocratic idealism, derived as much from Plato as from Calvin” (p. 140).

² For instance a Christian God who is an “utter and absolute despot” is a theological absurdity, and Milton in *Paradise Lost* is a very precise theologian.

in which it has its origin, then he seems hardly in position to dogmatize on Milton's artistic failure, much less to assert the poet's consciousness of his own shortcomings.

MAURICE KELLEY

Princeton University

Horace Walpole: Gardener and Architect. An Edition of Walpole's The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening with an Estimate of Walpole's Contribution to Landscape Architecture. By ISABEL WAKELIN URBAN CHASE. Princeton: Princeton University Press for University of Cincinnati, 1943. Pp. xxix + 285. \$3 50.

The title of this book—even bearing in mind its extensive subtitle—is its greatest inadequacy. If its author were a writer of detective fiction the work would, without doubt, be dubbed an “omnibus.” It is, first of all, an eleventh edition based upon the second or 1782 edition of Walpole's famous *History* with a careful listing of the earlier ten, and with footnotes giving all variants.

Following the text and its explanatory notes it is “An Estimate of Walpole's Contribution to Landscape Architecture”; this part is subdivided into “The Background of Walpole's Ideas on Landscape Design,” and “Walpole's Ideas on Gardening.” The third section of the book is “Actual Gardens of Walpole's Day.” The last chapter concerns itself with the effect of the eighteenth century poet-painter-gardeners upon the designers of the following century in England and upon the early American landscape designers. Though Walpole is given the center of the stage the work is much broader than a mere consideration of the man and his influence. Mrs. Chase succeeds in upholding Walpole's dual position as an historian of the “modern” and as a theorist who influenced the development of this new landscape art. At the same time she gives us a detailed and well documented account of the other players upon this stage, and a history of the gradual turning away from the old neo-classic ideal and the equally gradual development of the new informal landscape garden, and brings out the important part played in this development by the poet-painters and the philosophers of the aesthetic.

This study in its original form was presented to the English Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Cincinnati in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The book bears evidence to the scholarly approach of a student of English literature to such an extent that only a carping bibliographer would point out the fact that the 1790 edition instead of the original 1767 edition

of Wighte is mentioned in the bibliography and that Olmsted is consistently misspelled in both text and bibliography. It is to be hoped that this book is but a first fruit of Mrs. Chase's researches, and that it will be followed by further studies of others of those eighteenth century figures who, if they did not actually design their own or their friends' gardens, at least, exerted a powerful influence upon those who did.

KATHERINE MCNAMARA

*Harvard University,
Library of Landscape Architecture*

A Bibliography of Sir Walter Scott. A classified and annotated List of Books and Articles relating to his Life and Works, 1797-1940. By JAMES CLARKSON CORSON Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1943. Pp. xv + 428. 32 shillings.

This strikes me as being one of the best bibliographies I have ever looked into. Though it runs to nearly three thousand entries, it presents the results of rigorous selection, Dr. Corson by his own account having reduced his material by a half. It is indeed only as concerns the comprehensiveness of the original listing and the soundness of the principles of selection that any possibility of fault-finding can arise. To judge from the sampling I have made from my own rather haphazard lists, students of Scott will note the absence of some studies which they consider valuable, but will find references to so many articles they did not know of and ought to have known of that they will not be disposed to cavil. If they have published any discoveries on Scott, they will be lucky if they do not find that the same discovery has been announced before, perhaps more than once. (See, for example, Nos. 10, 744, and 2185; or Nos. 2177 and 2179.) The three thousand books and articles have been classified, listed, and described, with abundant cross-references and a full index, so that a reader can work either by subjects or authors; that is, can with equal ease find the special studies on Scott's translations from Burger, or compile a list of Andrew Lang's studies on Scott. I cannot say too much in praise of the critical annotations, which make the book a hundred times more interesting and useful. Dr. Corson has, in fact, insisted on *reading* all the works he has listed, a scrupulousness perhaps seldom observed by compilers of bibliographies. He has identified by the use of publishers' files the authors of many periodical articles hitherto listed as anonymous. For lucidity or method, accuracy of bibliographical reference, and fulness of critical analysis, this book will long stand as a model. Dr. Corson, it ought somewhere to be mentioned, is sub-librarian in Scott's own university of Edin-

burgh, Oliver and Boyd were publishing books in Edinburgh before Scott was born.

In reading this book (and I found it so interesting that I read every page), I kept asking myself why it was that so few significant scholarly studies in Scott have been written in America. Perhaps no English author after Shakespeare has been more written about, but the writing in both Britain and America has in the main been done by professional men of letters and amateur scholars. The Germans, as might be expected, have made Scott a quarry for dissertation subjects, but really few Americans have presented volumes on him in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Yet the pages of Dr Corson's book bristle with what look like good subjects for dissertations. Perhaps it is feared that they would be too much fun. A graduate student set to work on Scott is indeed assured of the pleasure of associating with the most attractive personality in English letters and of reading material of permanent literary importance. But he will also have a chance to acquire and display erudition by investigating the Latin, Norse, German, French, and older English sources that lie close to the surface in everything Scott wrote, and the constant opportunity to exert his critical faculty by exploring the nature of the aesthetic novelty in Scott's writing that gave it power, beyond most other English writing, to set a style. Is it that we are still aping the methods of science and cannot esteem a dissertation unless it makes a "discovery," and that Scott, for all his delight in cultivating mysteries about himself, is really not mysterious? I do not know, but I cannot be easy about our university instruction in English so long as it acquiesces in the present odd arrangement by which Scott's weaker productions are everywhere studied by juveniles and his best things hardly studied at all. I hope Dr. Corson's book will encourage us to make a change.

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

Yale University

Robert Burns: His Associates and Contemporaries. The *Tram*, Grierson, Young, and Hope Manuscripts, edited with an introduction by ROBERT T. FITZHUGH, with the *Journal of the Border Tour*, edited by DELANCEY FERGUSON. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1943. Pp. viii + 133.

The researcher into eighteenth century Scottish literature is continually learning of manuscript material which has never been published. Indeed, it is one of the irritations (and also one of the excitements) of working in this field that time and again one finds oneself wanting to consult a source that is to be found only at

the National Library at Edinburgh, or the University of Edinburgh Library, or the library of one of the other Scottish universities, or at the home of some Scottish family. That so much important source material for the writing of Scottish history (both general and literary) still remains unpublished is attributable to a variety of causes, but none of these causes would seem to operate in the case of Burns, whose life has been investigated with enthusiastic minuteness by many generations of researchers. The only reason why the Train manuscript has not seen the light much earlier seems to be that it was regarded as irresponsible and untrustworthy. James Grierson's notes, on which Train drew and which provide sufficiently convincing authority for Train's authenticity, were only recently located. The Young and Hope manuscripts are of less importance to the biographer of Burns, but of equal importance to anyone interested in the social life of the Scotland of that period.

In presenting these four sources, Professor Fitzhugh has made a real contribution to Burns scholarship. True, none of them adds anything very considerable to our knowledge of either the life or character of the poet, much of Grierson's material was used by Train who submitted it to Lockhart through whose biography of Burns it became part of the tradition. But there are some things in Grierson we cannot find elsewhere. Mr. Fitzhugh sums them up: "A group of anecdotes, a glimpse of Burns' mother, two minor poems, a considerable body of information about his associates and contemporaries, the circumstances surrounding the composition of 'To a Haggis,' new light on the quarrel with Creech, and the most direct link with Highland Mary on record." One is impressed by the sobriety and responsibility of all four writers: they are clearly doing their best to ascertain the truth and to correct errors. Grierson, who drew much of his material from Burns' friend Richmond, gets closer to Burns' youth than any of the others, but Alexander Young had been intimate with many of Burns' friends, and Charles Hope had dined in the poet's company more than once. Grierson, Train and Young all bring us closer to Burns, and even when the anecdote related is familiar, we may recognize for the first time the source of a tradition that came down from one of Burns' friends interrogated by Grierson, and passed on from him to Train and thence to Lockhart and the world.

One might wish for more extended notes on these papers: it would have been most useful to have those anecdotes which are corroborated by other sources pointed out, with the other sources indicated, and some inquiry into the few points which contradict the main tradition. An introduction concerning the development of the tradition would have placed the manuscripts in their proper perspective. Yet it would be ungenerous to complain that Mr. Fitzhugh has not given us more than he has when he has made such an important contribution. His introduction, though not the

"re-appraisal" of Burns that the publishers call it, for it is an expression of what is now the accepted point of view, is nevertheless a competent, sound, and well-informed survey, perhaps the best in such brief compass that exists.

Professor Ferguson, another American scholar who, like Professor Snyder, has shamed Scotland by producing better work on her national poet than any scholar now working there, contributes to this volume the "complete and undoctored text" of Burns' Journal of the Border Tour. The text is printed from a photostat of the original manuscript, restoring Allan Cunningham's omissions, and in doing so restoring to the Journal a vitality and an interest that Cunningham's text lacked. "The ideal edition of the Journal," remarks Mr. Ferguson, "would be fully annotated and accompanied by a facsimile," but he leaves this arduous task to another.

DAVID DAICHES

University of Chicago

BRIEF MENTION

La Grande Clarté du Moyen-Age. Par GUSTAVE COHEN. New York Editions de la maison française, 1943. Pp. 225. This small volume attempts to give "une histoire de la sensibilité médiévale et un tableau des acquisitions durables que nous lui devons." Naturally, in some 200 pages it is difficult to synthesize and correlate the literary, philosophical, social and artistic achievements of five hundred years. Differences of opinion about details, proportions and conclusions are therefore inevitable. Yet, despite questionable generalizations (of the type, "Le Moyen-Age a été tout amour et c'est pourquoi nous l'aimons," 109), irrelevant personal allusions (46, 53, 65, 113, 141, 149, etc.), unnecessary pedagogical definitions (i. e. of rhyme, assonance, phonetics, morphology, etc.), and various traces of hurried writing (see the sentence-paragraph concluding chapter I, the last sentence of page 65, *Gurboure* for *Gurbourc*, 110, the number four as a symbol of the Apostles, 147, etc.), this Cohen's-eye view of the Middle Ages contains many vivacious pages and stimulating suggestions. Among the best of these are the comparison of the prose romances to the great cathedrals in their growth from an original plan at the hands of successive artists (151), the equation of the fifteenth-century Passion Plays with various artistic products of the time (177 ff.), and the emphasis throughout on the fructifying force of a living faith.

G. F.

Poets at the Court of Ferrara Ariosto, Tasso and Guarini with a Chapter on Michelangelo. By GIACOMO GRILLO. Boston: Excelsior Press, 1943. Pp. xxi + 139. This book is written for students of the Renaissance who are familiar neither with the main facts about the lives of these four poets nor with judgments which Italian criticism has pronounced on them. Each essay includes a short biography with the historical background briefly sketched in, a digest of critical opinion on the poet's work, and, in the case of the first three, a résumé of the plot of his masterpiece. No fresh point of view is sought, no original formulation in critical interpretation is attempted. Four poets simply make an appearance here in clothes they have long worn and with the same expression on their faces that they have had in histories of literature now for some time. And, in the end, the author has not claimed more than this for his book.

C. S. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE "RÉCIT DE THÉRAMÈNE" ONCE MORE In his "brief reply" subjoined to my "Defense of the 'récit de Théràmène'" (*MLN*, June, 1944, pp. 387-91), Professor Lancaster apparently reverses the position taken in the passage from his *History* quoted in my article. I cited with approval (not disapproval as L. believes) his statement: "It is true . . . that so prolonged and rhetorical an explanation detracted from the poignancy of the situation by turning the audience's attention to the beauty of the description." But in his reply L. ignores this earlier remark and asserts that "the aesthetic repose offered by lines 1498-1560 enables the audience to feel more forcefully the indictment of Phèdre that follows."

I believe that Professor L. was correct the first time. As Racine and all good playwrights know, "timing" is of the utmost importance in producing and controlling dramatic effects. The tone, the plastic beauty, and the length of the *récit* soften the emotional and the moral impact of Théràmène's news at the precise moment when a simpler presentation might have produced the wrong effect upon the audience; Théràmène can speak more simply after line 1560 because the audience is then prepared to accept the situation without undue pathos or moral fervor.

My "disapproval" applied merely to the traditional and rather perfunctory explanation which L. gives for the length and the ornate style of the *récit*. I do not believe that Racine could have avoided the *récit* altogether and I readily acknowledge that (as I wrote in my article) "imitation of Euripides and Seneca played some part in the composition of the 'récit de Théràmène.'" But if "the example of two ancient and four French writers" explains why there had to be some kind of *récit*, it does not explain the specific characteristics of this passage in *Phèdre*. Nor is it

particularly enlightening for L to add that Racine "may well have thought that the passage would be well received," since the general aim of the classical dramatist was to "plaire"

In his reply Professor L seems to realize that these traditional explanations do not really explain the central problem with which my article was concerned. But while he attempts to refute my proposal, the only additional explanation which he himself ventures is the general observation "That he failed to do so [*i. e.*, to make the *récit* shorter and less ornate] was probably due to an increasing tendency towards descriptive writing, already found in *Iphigène* and to reappear in *Esther*" This remark, however, is merely quantitative, the critic must at least attempt to discover specific reasons in each play and in each scene for any marked increase in the amount of description.

Perhaps because he realizes that his last explanation will fail to satisfy the critic concerned with aesthetic and dramatic values, Professor L concludes his reply by asserting that whether Racine was wise or not in making the *récit* so long and elaborate "remains a matter of taste." Such a remark takes us back to the old-fashioned criticism of a La Harpe, for it lifts the *récit* completely out of its dramatic context and treats it as a more or less conventional "purple passage" to be evaluated according to the personal likes or dislikes of the critic. My whole article was an attempt to get away from this piecemeal type of criticism and to show the functional value of the *récit* in the total context of *Phèdre*. If he had been completely free from the influence of the ancients, Racine might have discovered a better dramatic and poetic solution than this long, ornate *récit*, for obviously this is not one of his finest scenes. But what I have tried to show is that, though influenced to some extent by his predecessors, Racine did not simply write a display piece; he composed the *récit* in such a way that it produces and controls the dramatic effects which he desired at that precise moment in his tragedy. Perhaps he or someone else could have invented a better way to do this, the point I wish to insist upon is that the way he adopted is not unsuccessful.

CARLOS LYNES, JR.

Washington, D. C.

[I am glad to learn that one of my remarks met with Mr. Lynes's approval, but I fail to see any inconsistency between what I wrote about the *récit* (vv. 1498-1560) and what I said in regard to vv. 1561 ff. It is rather Mr. L. who shifts his attitude, for, if "every word" in *Phèdre* "advances the course of the heroine's ineluctable march toward catastrophe" (p. 387 above), there would be no criticism of the *récit* and one would hesitate to assert that "this long, ornate *récit* . . . is not one of his finest scenes." Mr. L. holds that lines 1498-1560 prepared the audience "to accept the situation without undue pathos or moral fervor." I contend that, though the verses had this effect while they were being spoken, the aesthetic repose they offer "enables the audience to feel more forcefully the indist-

ment of Phèdre that follows." In the hands of a lesser artist the account of Hippolyte's death may become gruesome, as it does with Seneca, or comic, as it does with La Fontaine. Racine avoided these effects and produced what I have called "a fine description in the French classical manner." Whether in doing so he used all the restraint of which he was capable, whether or not the descriptive poet in him got the better of the dramatist, does remain a matter of taste, about which, long before La Harpe, it was said, "non est disputandum"—H. C. L.]

THE ETYMOLOGY OF GERMAN *Scheunst*. In *MLN*, LVII, 169 ff. Professor Kurrelmeyer discusses the word *scheunst*, *scheuenst*, *scheuens* 'niederwärts,' which appears in the military manual of Johann Jacobi v. Wallhausen (1615), and believes it to be from the Dutch *schuims* 'obliquus, schiag.' It referred originally, as a number of the examples quoted shows, to the carrying of a spear with the point down. This word was probably borrowed in late mediaeval times into Low German from the French. It is nothing other than OF *jls* < *ācorsum* (but influenced by *sus* < *sursum*) adv. 'à bas, en bas, par terre.' For the initial *j* was substituted *sch* as for instance in MHG *schorc* < *jore*, *schavelin* < *javelin*, the *ā*, pronounced *q̄* (i.e. like *iu* in MHG), became regularly *eu* (cf. German *Abenteuer* < MHG *āventiure* < OF *aventure* < Lat. *ad ventūra*); the *n* is inserted as in *sonst*, *umsonst* (MHG *su(n)st*, *umbe sus*); the final *t* in *scheuenst*, *scheunst* is the excrescent *t* we find in *emst*. Adverbs in *-ens*, which are fairly common in German (cf. older *benebens*, *unverschens*, *vergebens* etc.), may have aided in the formation of *scheuens* (the form for Dutch given in Kilian's *Dictionarium schuim* 'transversus, obliquus' is most likely corrupt).

EDWARD H. SEIBT

George Washington University

ERRATA. P. 11, l. 19, for 16th read 13th; p. 92, l. 9, for adjectives read adjective; p. 98, l. 16, for politischen read unpolitischen.

The authors concerned had an opportunity to correct these errors in MS. or proof.

INDEX

SUBJECTS

Addison

A Note on Keats and — 572

Albrecht von Eyb, Medieval Moralist 509

American Drama

Annals of the New York Stage, XIII (1885-1888) 219

American Literature

The Connecticut Wits 359, Down-East Spirituals and Others 365, The Patterns of English and American Fiction 364, Sterne and Sensibility in American Diaries 403

American Novel

The First American Novelist? 137.

Antipodes 441

Archie Armstrong's Auth 297

Ariosto

Poets at the Court of Ferrara 584.

Arnold

A Note on —'s "Civilisation in the United States" 173

Ars Moriendi

The Art of Dying Well The Development of the — 191

Arthurian Literature

Count Philip's Book and the *Graal* 559

Bacon, Francis, on Communication and Rhetoric 505

Bahuvrīhi in Sears-Roebuck 515.

Balzac, H de

A Phase of Pereda's Writings in Imitation of — 460.

Balzac, Jean-Louis Guez de, Une Réminiscence latine de 285.

Baudelaire, Sur une lettre de 395.

Beaumont and Fletcher

The Source of the Principal Plot of *The Fair Maid of the Inn* 122

Beowulf

On fæder feorme, —, Line 21 113.

Boccaccio

Decameron VIII, 9 *carapignare* 88

Britain, A Literary Journey through Wartime 511

Browning

—'s "Parley" and de Lassay's "Mémoire" 553, Mill and *Pauline* the 'Review' that 'Retarded' —'s Fame 410

Burns, Robert His Associates and Contemporaries 581

Butler

A Grant to 'Hudibras' — 281

Byron's *Hours of Idleness* and Other than Scotch Reviewers 547

Canadian Modern Language Review, The 510

Carapignare 88

Casella and Spitzer, Jaufre Rudel 526

Catalan Language in the 13th Century, The Rise of 9

Catherine de Medici, see Tory, G.

Chapman

Sonnet Structure in —'s Blank Verse 397.

Chaucer

Alysoun's Other Tonne 481, Another Analogue for the Violation of the Maiden in the "Wife of Bath's Tale" 271; Canon's Yeoman's Prologue, G, LL 563-66. Horse or Man 269, *The Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey — 217; —'s Eight Years' Sickness 178, —'s Irregular -E A Demonstration among Monosyllabic Nouns of the Exceptions to Grammatical and Metrical Harmony 188, —'s Knight and the Hundred Years' War 45, *Hymseiven lik a pilgrym to desguise Troilus*, V, 1577 176, Some Further — Allusions 568; Was Robyn the Miller's Youth Misspent? 47.

"Chrestiens de la sainture" 484.

Coleridge

—'s 'Hymn before Sunrise' 358; A Footnote to *The Road to Xanadu* 333, Greta Hall 436, An Indebtedness of — to Crashaw 551.

Comme quov 454.

Court of Sapience, Notes on the Plimpton Manuscript of the 5 Crashaw, An Indebtedness of Coleridge to 551

Cuban Drama

Historia de la literatura dramática cubana 432

Dante

Beatrice's Eyes 466, The Farcical Elements in *Inferno* Cantos XXI-XXIII 83, "Sounding Brass" 468

Dasypodius, Der Begriff "Deutschland" im Wörterbuch des 378

Davenant, Selected Poems of Sir William 220

Defoe

—'s Sources for *Robert Drury's Journal* 200, Scott's *Antiquary* and

—'s *History of Apparitions* 550.

Delille, Victor Hugo et 37.

Dennis, The Critical Works of John 354.

Deutschland 378.

Diderot

The Chronology of —'s Journey to Langres in 1759 33.

Donne, John, The Complete Poems of 141.

Dostoyevsky, The Double of 317.

Drama

Climates of Tragedy 128.

Dryden, John, The Letters of, with Letters Addressed to Him 200.

Education, Experiments in 220.

Edward the Confessor, The Middle English Verse Life of 193.

envel 321.

English

The American Language 335;

Anglo French Etymologies 223;

The Art of Letter Writing. An Essay on the Handbooks Published in England during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries 203;

Bahuvrīhi in Sears-Roebuck 515;

Clichés and Their Sources 50; —

Sheer (off) 42; *Nincompoop* 565;

A Note on the Formation of Preterit-Present Verbs 415; Notes on Some Physical Terms in the *NED.*:

Corrigenda 419; A Pronouncing Dictionary of American — 575;

Situation as a Term in Literary Criticism 392; *Sycomore* 493;

Tourist 334; *Wad* 478.

English Ballads 297.

English Drama

A Comparison between the Two Stages A Late Restoration Book of the Theatre 219; The Globe Playhouse Its Design and Equipment 198, Materials for the Study of — (Renaissance) 128, A Short View of Elizabethan Drama 133

English History

Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions 70, The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes 148, Religion and Empire, the Alliance between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion, 1558 1625 356, Urbane Travelers, 1591-1635 218

English Literature

The Concise Cambridge History of — 350; Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association 295, 428; A History of — 287; London in Flames, London in Glory 206, The Patterns of English and American Fiction 364, The Seventeenth Century Background 437; Studies in the Comic 215; Victorian Prelude 71.

English Novel, Cavalcade of the 287.

English Poetry

English Bards and Grecian Marbles, The Relationship between Sculpture and Poetry, Especially in the Romantic Period 211; Irish Poetry from the English Invasion to 1798 422; Religious Trends in — 290

Ermanaric, the Legends of 183

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association 295, 428.

Fackten 21.

Farrant, Richard, *The Wars of Cyrus* 128.

Fary, Knight, *The, or Oberon the Second* 128.

Fiction, The Imaginary Voyage in Prose 137.

Fielding

The Making of "Jonathan Wild": A Study in the Literary Method of Henry — 137; A Note on the Authorship of *Shamela* 571.

Fischfackten 21.

Fletcher

The Author of "The Address" in Quarles's *Shepheards Oracles* 118; see Beaumont.

Floßfackten 21.

- France
 La Grande Clarté du Moyen-Age 583
- French
 Anglo-French Etymologies 223,
Antipodes 441, "Chrestiens de la
 sainture" 484, *Comme quoi* 454,
 A Contribution to the History of
 "r grasseye" 562, — Syntax List
 502, *Situation* as a Term in
 Literary Criticism 392
- French Drama
 An Anonymous Sixteenth Century
 French Play on the Death of
 Lucretia 448
- French Poetry
 The Genres of Parnassian Poetry
 A Study of the Parnassian Minors
 420
- Freneau, A Note on Three Lyrics of
 Philip 313
- Fuller, Margaret, see Ossoli
- Galt, A Study of the Novels of John
 145
- Gawain, *Sir, and the Green Knight*
 342
- German
 Der Begriff "Deutschland" im
 Wörterbuch des Dasypodius 378;
 Einzel = einzal 321, The Ety-
 mology of — *scheunst* 586, *Fackten*,
Fischfackten, *Floßfackten*, and
 Similar Words 21; *Hangematte*
 374; *Nazn und Sozn* 93; Noch ein-
 mal "Wes das Herz voll ist"
 221, *Pythomssa* 26, Wienerisch
Remassuri 100
- German Literature
 Grete's Bad Name Again 368, Mary-
 Verse in Meistergesang 367, An
 Unpublished MHG Version of
 Pseudo Aristotelian Proverbs 31
- German Pageantry
 The Nuremberg Schembart Car-
 nival 508
- Godwin, William
Caleb Williams 315; Shelley's
 First Published Review of *Mande-
 ville* 172
- Goethe
 —'s *Iphigenie auf Tauris* 209;
 Gotthelf Heinrich Schubert und
 —'s "Selige Sehnsucht" 369;
Pythomssa Faust II, l. 9135 26.
- Goldsmith 310
- Gosson, Stephen. a Biographical
 and Critical Study 427.
- Gray, Thomas, as a Literary Critic
 146
- Greek
 English Bards and Grecian Marbles
 211
- Greene, Richard T
 Melville's Friend "Toby" 52
- Greta Hall 436
- Greville
 Fulke —'s *Caelica*. An Evaluation
 218
- Guarini
 Poets at the Court of Ferrara 584
- Hangematte 374
- Hallam, The Writings of Arthur 426
- Henryson
 A Note on Robert —'s Allusions
 to Religion and Law 257, Robert
 — and the Leper Cresseid 265
- Herbert
 George —'s *Sycamore* 493.
- Heywood, John
 Authorship and Sources of "Gentle-
 ness and Nobility" 128, The Back-
 ground of —'s "Witty and Wit-
 less" 128, —'s "Play of the
 Wether" 128
- Hofmannsthal
Christmas Heimreise und ihr Vor-
 bild 104, Die Quelle von —'s *Frau
 ohne Schatten* 385
- Holyday, Barten, *Technogamia* 128
- Hopkins, Gerard Manley, God's
 "Plenitude" in the Poetry of 408
- Hrotsvitha
 Knowledge of —'s Works Prior to
 1500 382
- Hugo, Victor, et Delille 37.
- Hume
 The Forgotten — Le Bon David
 294.
- Iceland, Thralldom in Ancient 507.
- Icelandic Literature
 Bibliographic Notes 430.
- Irish
 More — Words in Spenser 472
- Jaufré Rudel, Casella and Spitzer 526.
- Johnson, Samuel
 — "Making Aether" 286; 'Re-
 ligious Sentimentalism in the Age
 of — 290; Thrahana 67
- Keats
 —'s "To the Nile" 331; A Note
 on — and Addison 572.

- Kleist, Zum Problem der Novelle bei 149.
- Langland
Worth Both His Hais 222, see Milton
- Lassay, de
Browning's "Parley" and —'s "Mémoire" 553
- Latin -et- > Old French *et* 75
- Legenda Aurea*, The English Prose Translation of 181
- Lennox, C R
The First American Novelist? 137
- Mark Twain 310
- Maupassant
Personal Sources for —'s *Contes* 277.
- Melville
The Fine Symbolism in *Moby Dick* 304; —'s Friend "Toby" 52; The Publication of —'s *Piazza Tales* 56
- Meredith's *The Egoist* as a Play 165.
- Michelangelo
Poets at the Court of Ferrara 584.
- Middle English, The, Verse Life of Edward the Confessor 193.
- Mill, J S
— and *Pauline*: the 'Review' That 'Retarded' Browning's Fame 410; *The Spirit of the Age* 210.
- Milton
— in the Puritan Revolution 142; —'s Royalism: A Study of the Conflict of Symbol and Idea in the Poems 578; —'s Winged Serpents 537; Poets and Their Critics: Langland and — 205; A Preface to *Paradise Lost* 205; Rime in *Paradise Lost* 171.
- Milton, John (Sr.), Scrivener, 1590 1632 532.
- Molière
Omissions and Additions to *Fifty Years of — Studies* 282.
- Morley, The Liberal Mind of John 435.
- Nazi 93.
- NED.
Notes on Some Physical Terms in the —: Corrigenda 419.
- Newman
A — Treasury: Selections from the Prose Works of John Henry Cardinal — 437.
- Nincompoop* 565.
- Nine Herbs Charm* 157
- Norm, Frank, a Study 434
- Norwegian Word Studies 61
- Obituaries
Armstrong, E C 206, Spenser, Hazleton v
- Old English
The Nine Herbs 157, Two — Textual Errors 40, Two — Words 106
- Old English Poetry
The Anglo Saxon Minor Poems 497
- Old French
Anglo Norman Letters and Petitions 70, *Baus Nus* 92, Latin -et- > — *et* 75.
- Old Norse
Regarding the Prefix *ǫ-* in — *miss*, 'victim' 175
- Old Norwegian
Survivals in — of Medieval English, French and German Literature, together with the Latin Versions of the Heroic Legend of Walter of Aquitaine 147
- Ossoli, Margaret Fuller, c 1 suoi corrispondenti 361.
- Otfrid's *Ad Laubertum*, Some Notes on 513.
- Parise la Duchesse, Readings from 490.
- Parnell's "Hymn to Contentment" 329.
- Pascal, The Clue to 438.
- Pathomachia* 128.
- Pearl*: *Lere Leke*, 210 417
- Pereda's Writings in Imitation of Balzac, A Phase of 460.
- Petrarch and the Renaissance 574.
- Philippe de Thain's *Bestiaire*, The Historical Background of 325.
- Piozzi, Mrs., see Thrall.
- Pitt, Smollett and the Elder 250.
- Plato on the Trial and Death of Socrates 215.
- Pleasant Quippers for Upstart New fangled Gentlewomen* 428.
- Poe's "Eldorado," The Meaning of 59.
- Pope, Alexander, The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of 202.
- Proverbs, An Unpublished MEG Version of Pseudo-Aristotelian 31.
- Pushkin, see Shervchenko.
- Pythonissa* 26.

- Quarles's *Shepherds Oracles*, The Author of "The Address" in 118
- Racine
A Defense of the "Récit de Thérémène" 387, 584
- Randolph, Thomas, *The Fary Knight* 128
- Reginald of Canterbury, *The Vita Sancti Malchi* of 292
- Remassuri 100
- "r grasseyé," A Contribution to the History of 562.
- Rilke
The Last New Volumes of —'s Letters 438, A Silly Sonnet to Orpheus 556
- Rudel, see Jaufre Rudel
- Ruin, *The*, Again 72
- Ruskin, John, The Educational Theories of 216
- Russian Literature (1880-1940), An Outline of Modern 366
- scheunst, The Etymology of German 586
- Schubert, G. H., und Goethes "Selige Sehnsucht" 369.
- Scott
A Bibliography of Sir Walter — 580, —'s *Antiquary* and Defoe's *History of Apparitions* 550
- Sears Roebuck, Bahuvrīhi in 515
- Secunda Pastorum* 297
- Shakespeare
"Courtesy" in — 133, The Editorial Problem in — 139, Falstaff's Clothes 162; Hamlet, Melancholy, and the Devil 120, Hamlet. The Prince or the Poem? 128; The Oration in — 128, — and The Nature of Man 128, —'s Dove-House 160, —'s Satire 133; Stolne and Surreptitious Copies, A Comparative Study of —'s Bad Quartos 196, William —'s Petty School 133
- Shamela*, A Note on the Authorship of 571.
- Sheer (off)* 42.
- Shelley
An Early Quotation from — 335; — and the Reviewers Once More 539, —'s First Published Review of *Mandeville* 172, —'s Revised Will 542; The Stoppage of —'s Income in 1821 545, Variant Readings in Three of —'s Poems 274.
- Sheridan's "Little Bronze Pliny" 164.
- Shevchenko and Pushkin's *To the Slanderers of Russia* 495
- Summs, W. G., *Martin Faber* 315
- Situation* 392
- Smith, Charlotte, Poet and Novelist (1749-1806) 137
- Smollett, The Later Career of Tobias — 208, — and the Elder Pitt 250
- Southey
Greta Hall 436.
- Sozi* 93.
- Spanish Drama, see Cuban Drama
- Spenser
An Immediate Source for *Faerie Queene*, Bk. V, Proem 469, More Irish Words in — 472, —'s *Lucifera* and *Philotime* 413, —'s "Stony Aubrian" 1, Stanza Continuity in *The Faerie Queene* 114, *Variorum* —, Minor Poems 511, The Works of Edmund — 336
- Spitzer, Jaufre Rudel, Casella and 526
- Stage Decoration
From Art to Theatre Form and Convention in the Renaissance 572.
- Steele, The Correspondence of Richard 69
- Sterne and Sensibility in American Diaries 403, This is Lorence, a Narrative of the Reverend Laurence — 363
- Strindberg's *Fadren* and the Théâtre Libre 567.
- Sycamore* 493
- T. H. (1594), *Oenone and Paris* 214.
- Talbot Epitaph, An Earlier 327.
- Tasso
Poets at the Court of Ferrara 584.
- Tennyson in Egypt A Study of the Imagery of His Earlier Work 362
- Thrale
Thraliana. The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809 67.
- Tory, Geoffroy
— and Catherine de Medici, an unpublished manuscript of — of the genealogy of the Counts of Boulogne concerning the French ancestry of Catherine de Medici, Queen of France 218.
- Tourist* 334.
- Towneley Cycle 297.
- Vie de Saint Thomas Becket, v. 4941 487.

Wad 478

- Walpole, Horace Gardenist An Edition of —'s *The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening* with an Estimate of —'s Contribution to Landscape Architecture 579
 Walter of Aquitaine, see Old Norwegian
 Walton, Izaak
 The Author of "The Address" in Quarles's *Shepherds Oracles* 118

- Wars of Cyrus, The* An Early Classical Narrative Drama of the Child Actors 128
 Welsh Riddles, A Collection of 213
 Whetstone, George Mid Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters 113
 Whitman, Walt 61
 Wordsworth
 A New — Letter 168, —'s Formative Years 424
 Zola aux Etats-Unis 431

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Adams, J. C., *The Globe Playhouse* 198
 Adams, J. Q. (ed.), *Oenone and Paris* by T. H. (1594) 214.
 Allen, D. C., George Herbert's *Synonymes* 493; Milton's Winged Serpents 537.
 Allen, R. B., *Wad* 478.
 Alspach, R. K., Irish Poetry from the English Invasion to 1798 422.
 Ansen, A. J., Some Notes on Otfrid's *Ad Luibertum* 513
 Arrom, J. J., Historia de la literatura dramática cubana 432.
 Atkins, S., The American Language 335
 Atkinson, D. F., Some Further Chaucer Allusions 568.
 Aubin, R. A. (ed.), London in Flames, London in Glory 206; *Tourist* 334.
 Austin, H. D., Beatrice's Eyes 466; "Sounding Brass" 468.
 Babb, L., Hamlet, Melancholy and the Devil 120.
 Balderston, K. C. (ed.), *Thraliana* 67.
 Baldwin, T. W., William Shakespeare's Petty School 133.
 Ball, R. H., A Short View of Elizabethan Drama 133.
 Bennett, R. E. (ed.), The Complete Poems of John Donne 141.
 Bentley, N. E., A Grant to 'Hudibras' Butler 281.
 Berry, E. G., Clichés and Their Sources 50
 Bhattacharjee, M. M., "Courtesy" in Shakespeare 133.
 Blanchard, R. (ed.), The Correspondence of Richard Steele 69.
 Bonjour, A., Coleridge's 'Hymn before Sunrise' 358.
 Bowers, F. T. (ed.), *The Fairy Knight or Oberon the Second* 128
 Boyd, J., Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris* 209.
 Brady, C., The Legends of Eimannaric 183.
 Brawner, J. P. (ed.), *The Wars of Cyrus* 128
 Briggs, H. E., A Note on Kents and Addison 572
 Brinson, B. H., Studies in the Comic 215
 Brooke, T., Shakespeare's Dove House 160
 Brown, J. J., Samuel Johnson "Making Aether" 286
 Billier, C. F., Notes on the Plimpton Manuscript of the *Court of Sapience* 5.
 Bush, D. (ed.), Selected Poems of Sir William Davenant 220
 Butt, J. (ed.), The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope 202.
 Cailliet, E., The Clue to Pascal 438
 Caldwell, J. R., Studies in the Comic 215.
 Cameron, K. W., Authorship and Sources of "Gentleness and Nobility" with a Text of the Play; The Background of John Heywood's "Witty and Witlesse", John Heywood's "Play of the Wether" 128
 Campbell, O. J., Shakespeare's Satire 133
 Cavanaugh, M. J. C. (ed.), Barten Holyday, *Technogamia* 128.
 Chambers, R. W., Poets and Their Critics: Langland and Milton 205.
 Chapman, R. W. (ed.), *Essays and*

- Studies by Members of the English Association, XXVIII 295
- Chase, I W U (ed.), Horace Walpole Gardenist 579
- Christ, R W, see Saintonge, P.
- Clark, R E, French Syntax List 502
- Coad, O S, The Meaning of Poe's "Eldorado" 59
- Coffman, G R, Another Analogue for the Violation of the Maiden in the "Wife of Bath's Tale" 271, Canon's Yeoman's Prologue, G, LL 563-66 Horse or Man 269
- Cohen, G (ed.), Geoffroy Tory and Catherine de Medici 218, La Grande Clarté du Moyen-Age 583
- Cook, V, Browning's "Parley" and de Lassay's "Mémoire" 553
- Cooper, L, Experiments in Education 220, (tr.), Plato on the Trial and Death of Socrates 215
- Corson, J C, A Bibliography of Sir Walter Scott 580
- Dabney, L E, An Anonymous Sixteenth Century French Play on the Death of Lucretia 448
- Dahlström, C E W L, Strindberg's *Fadren* and the Théâtre Libre 567
- Davis, E. B., Latin -et- > Old French et 75
- Day, M. (ed.), *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 342.
- Deen, F. H., The Genesis of *Martin Faber* in *Caleb Williams* 315.
- Delattre, P., A Contribution to the History of "r grasseyé" 562.
- Detli, E., Margaret Fuller Ossoli 361
- Dobbie, E. V K (ed.), The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems 497
- Durham, W H, Studies in the Comic 215.
- Eoff, S., A Phase of Pereda's Writings in Imitation of Balzac 460.
- Esdaille, A (ed.), Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association 428.
- Fairchild, H. N., Religious Trends in English Poetry 290
- Fausset, H I'A, Walt Whitman: Poet of Democracy 64
- Feise, E, Gotthilf Heinrich Schubert und Goethes "Selige Sehnsucht" 360.
- Ferguson, D. (ed.), Robert Burns 581.
- Fess, G M., Personal Sources for Maupassant's *Contes* 277
- Feuillerat, A, Sur une lettre de Baudelaire 395
- Fitzhugh, R T (ed.), Robert Burns 581
- Frank, G, *Biaus Niés* 92, Jaufré Rudel, Casella and Spitzer 526
- Frost, W, Fulke Greville's *Caelica* An Evaluation 218
- Fuerst, N, A Silly Sonnet to Orpheus 556
- Gegenheimer, A. F., A Note on the Formation of Preterit Present Verbs 415.
- Gerould, G H, The Patterns of English and American Fiction 364.
- Gibbens, V E, A Note on Three Lyrics of Philip Freneau 313
- Glasheen, A E, Shelley's First Published Review of *Mandeville* 172
- Glasheen, F J, An Early Quotation from Shelley 335
- Gohdes, C, Melville's Friend "Toby" 52
- Gollancz, Sir I (ed.), *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 342.
- Gove, P B, The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction 137
- Greg, W. W., The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare 139
- Greene, C R, A Note on the Authorship of *Shamela* 571
- Grillo, G, Poets at the Court of Ferrara 584.
- Hagstotz, H. B., The Educational Theories of John Ruskin 216
- Haight, G S, The Author of "The Address" in Quarles's *Shepherds Oracles* 118
- Haines, L F, Mill and *Pauline*. the 'Review' That 'Retarded' Brownings's Fame 410.
- Ham, E B, Readings from *Parise la Duchesse* 490
- Hankins, J E, Spenser's *Lucifera* and *Philotime* 413.
- Harbage, A, Materials for the Study of English Renaissance Drama 128.
- Harrold, C F (ed.), A Newman Treasury 437.
- Hart, A, Stohne and Surreptitious Copies, a Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos 196.
- Hartley, L, This is Lorence, a Narrative of the Reverend Laurence Sterne 363.

- Hatcher, A. G., Bahuvihli in Sears-Roeback 515
- Haugen, E., Norwegian Word Studies 61
- Havens, G. R., The Chronology of Diderot's Journey to Langres in 1759 33
- Havens, R. D., Parnell's "Hymn to Contentment" 329
- Hayek, F. A. von (ed.), *The Spirit of the Age* by J. S. Mill 210
- Herben, S. J., *The Ruin* Again 72
- Hermannsson, H., Bibliographic Notes 430
- Hilbish, F. M. A., Charlotte Smith, Poet and Novelist (1749-1806) 137
- Hiller, J. A., Albrecht von Eyb, Medieval Moralist 509
- Hillmann, Sister M. V., *Pearl: Lere Leke*, 210 417.
- Hooker, E. N. (ed.), The Critical Works of John Dennis 354.
- Howard, E. J. (ed.), *The Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey Chaucer 217; (ed.), *Pleasant Quippes for Upstart Newfangled Gentlewomen* 428.
- Howard, L., The Connecticut Wits 359
- Howe, H. W., Greta Hall 436
- Hudson, R. B., Meredith's *The Egoist* as a Play 165.
- Hull, V. E., A Collection of Welsh Riddles 213.
- Irwin, W. R., The Making of "Jonathan Wild" 137
- Ives, S. A. (tr.), Geoffroy Tory and Catherine de Medici 218.
- Izard, T. C., George Whetstone 143.
- Jackson, G. P. (ed.), Down-East Spirituals and Others 365.
- Jeremy, Sister M., The English Prose Translation of *Legenda Aurea* 181.
- Jones, F. L., Shelley's Revised Will 542.
- Jones, L. C., The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes 148.
- Kaderly, N. L., The Stoppage of Shelley's Income in 1821 545.
- Kennedy, C. W., The Earliest English Poetry 194.
- Kennedy, M. B., The Oration in Shakespeare 128.
- Kenyon, J. S., A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English 575.
- Kernodle, G. R., From Art to Theatre 572
- Kliger, S., God's "Plenitude" in the Poetry of Gerald Manley Hopkins 408
- Knapp, L. M., Smollett and the Elder Pitt 250
- Knott, T. A., see J. S. Kenyon
- Krappe, A. H., *Antipodes* 441, The Historical Background of Philippe de Thaun's *Bestiaire* 325
- Knuelmeyer, W., *Einzel* = *einzel* 321, *Fachten*, *Fischfachten*, *Floßfachten*, and Similar Words 21, *Hangematte* 374
- Lancaster, H. C., E. C. Armstrong 296, Replies to Lynes 391, 585, *Situation* as a Term in Literary Criticism 392
- Larrabee, S. A., English Bards and Grecian Marbles 211.
- Legge, M. D. (ed.), Anglo Norman Letters and Petitions from All Souls MS 182 70
- Lehman, B. H., Studies in the Comic 215
- Levi Della Vida, G., "Christiens de la sainture" 484.
- Levy, R., *La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket*, v 4941 487.
- Lewis, C. S., Hamlet. The Prince or the Poem? 128; A Preface to *Paradise Lost* 205.
- Lievsey, J. L., An Immediate Source for *Faerie Queene*, Bk. V, Proem 469.
- Lind, L. R. (ed.), *The Vita Sancti Malchi* of Reginald of Canterbury 292.
- Livingston, C. H., English *Sheer* (off) 42.
- Logan, Sister E., An Indebtedness of Coleridge to Crashaw 551.
- Loomis, R. S., Chaucer's Eight Years' Sickness 178.
- Lotspeich, H. G. (ed.), The Works of Edmund Spenser 336.
- Lovett, R. M., A History of English Literature 287.
- Lyell, F. H., A Study of the Novels of John Galt 145.
- Lynes, C., A Defense of the "Récit de Thérémène" 387, 584.
- Mabbott, T. O., Grete's Bad Name Again 368.
- Mackay, J. A., see Cailliet.

- McKenzie, G., *Studies in the Comic* 215
- McJimsey, R. B., *Chaucer's Irregular -E* 188
- Magoun, F. P., Jr., *Hymselfen lik a pilgrym to desgise Troilus*, V, 1577 176, see Smyser, H. M.
- Manning, C. A., *The Double of Dostoyevsky* 317, *Shevchenko and Pushkin's To the Slanderers of Russia* 495
- Marchand, E., *Frank Norris, a Study* 434
- Martz, L. L., *The Later Career of Tobias Smollett* 208
- Mason, D. E. (ed.), *The Works of Edmund Spenser* 336
- Mautner, F. H., *Nazi und Sozi* 93
- Maxwell, B., *The Source of the Principal Plot of The Fair Maid of the Inn* 122
- Maynard, G. H., *The First American Novelist?* 137
- Menner, R. J., *Two Old English Words* 106
- Meroney, H., *The Nine Herbs* 157, *Two Old English Textual Errors* 40
- Metzendorf, R. F., *A New Wordsworth Letter* 168
- Meyer, G. W., *Wordsworth's Formative Years* 424
- Mezger, F., *On fæder feorme, Beowulf*, Line 21 113
- Millett, F. B., *A History of English Literature* 287
- Mitchell, A. G., *Worth Both His Ears* 222.
- Moody, W. V., *A History of English Literature* 287
- Moore, A. K., *Alysoun's Other Tonne* 481
- Moore, G. E., *The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor* 193.
- Moore, J. R., *Defoe's Sources for Robert Drury's Journal* 200, *Scott's Antiquary and Defoe's History of Apparitions* 550; *Sheridan's "Little Bronze Pliny"* 164.
- Mossner, E. C., *The Forgotten Hume* 294
- Motter, T. H. V. (ed.), *The Writings of Arthur Hallam* 426
- Naumann, W., *Christinas Heimreise und ihr Vorbild* 104; *Die Quelle von Hofmannsthal's Frau ohne Schatten* 385
- Nitchie, E., *Variant Readings in Three of Shelley's Poems* 274
- Nitze, W. A., *Count Philip's Book and the Graal* 559
- O'Connor, M. A., *Climates of Tragedy* 128
- O'Connor, Sister M. C., *The Art of Dying Well* 191
- O'Connor, W. V., see O'Connor, M. A.
- Odell, G. C. D., *Annals of the New York Stage, XIII (1885-1888)* 219
- Osgood, C. G., *Variorum Spenser, Minor Poems* 511, (ed.), *The Works of Edmund Spenser* 336
- Paden, W. D., *Tennyson in Egypt* 362
- Parker, W. R., *John Milton, Scrivener, 1590-1632* 532
- Parrott, T. M., *Mak and Archie Armstrong* 297; *A Short View of Elizabethan Drama* 133
- Paulsen, W., *Zum Problem der Novelle bei Kleist* 149
- Pearce, J. A., *An Earlier Talbot Epitaph* 327
- Pearce, R. H., *Sterne and Sensibility in American Diaries* 403
- Penrose, B., *Urbane Travelers, 1591-1635* 218
- Poston, L., Jr., *French Syntax List* 502
- Pratt, R. A., *Was Robyn the Miller's Youth Misspent?* 47
- Purcell, J. M., *Rime in Paradise Lost* 171
- Quinlan, M. J., *Victorian Prelude, a History of English Manners, 1700-1830* 71.
- Richeson, A. W., *Notes on Some Physical Terms in the NED Corrigenda* 419
- Ringler, W., *Stephen Gosson* 427.
- Robertson, J., *The Art of Letter Writing* 203
- Roman, H., *The Last New Volume of Balke's Letters* 438
- Ross, M. M., *Milton's Royalism* 578
- Ross, J. F., *Studies in the Comic* 215.
- Saintonge, P. and Christ, R. W., *Omissions and Additions to Fifty Years of Molière Studies* 282.
- Salvan, A. J., *Zola aux États-Unis* 431
- Sampson, G., *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature* 350.

- Schaffer, A, The Genies of Parnasian Poetry 420
- Schinz, A, Victor Hugo et Delille 37
- Schirokauer, A, Der Begriff "Deutschland" im Wörterbuch des Dasypodius 378, Noch einmal. "Wes das Herz voll ist" 221
- Schroeder, Sister M J, Mary-Verse in Meistergesang 367
- Sealts, M M, The Publication of Melville's *Piazza Tales* 56
- Seely, F F, A Footnote to *The Road to Xanadu* 333.
- Sehrt, E H, The Etymology of German *scheunst* 586
- Selmer, C, An Unpublished MHG Version of Pseudo-Aristotelian Proverbs 31
- Sejeantson, M S. (ed.), *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 342
- Seyrig, H., Une Réminiscence latine de Jean Louis Guez de Balzac 285
- Simmons, E J, An Outline of Modern Russian Literature (1880-1940) 366
- Singleton, C. S., *Decameron*, VIII, 9 *carapagnare* 88.
- Smith, P E. (ed.), *Pathomachia* 128.
- Smith, R M, More Irish Words in Spenser 472, Spenser's "Stony Aubrian" 1.
- Smyser, H. M. (tr.), Survivals in Old Norwegian of Medieval English, French and German Literature 147.
- Spencer, T., Shakespeare and The Nature of Man 128.
- Spitzer, L., Anglo-French Etymologies 223, *Comme quoi* 454; The Farcical Elements in *Inferno*, Cantos XXI-XXIII 83; *Nincompoop* 565, Wienerisch *Remassuri* 100; see Singleton, C. S.
- Staebler, W., The Liberal Mind of John Morley 435.
- Starr, H. W., Gray as a Literary Critic 146.
- Stearns, M. W., A Note on Robert Henryson's Allusions to Religion and Law 257; Robert Henryson and the Leper Cresseid 265.
- Stein, A., Sonnet Structure in Chapman's Blank Verse 397; Stanza Continuity in *The Faerie Queene* 114.
- Stillwell, G., Chaucer's Knight and the Hundred Years' War 45.
- Sturtevant, A. M., Regarding the Prefix *y-* in Old Norse *y-miss*, 'vicissim' 175
- Sumbeig, S L, The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival 508
- Taylor, A., A Collection of Welsh Riddles 213
- Templeman, W. D., A Note on Arnold's "Civilisation in the United States" 173.
- Thompson, D W., Keats's "To the Nile" 331
- Tillotson, G (ed.), *The Rape of the Lock* and Other Poems 202
- Wagenknecht, E., Cavalcade of the English Novel 287
- Walcutt, C. C., The Fine Symbolism in *Moby Dick* 304
- Wallace, K R., Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric 505.
- Walz, J A, *Pythomassa. Faust II*, L 9135 26
- Ward, A. C., A Literary Journey through Wartime Britain 511.
- Ward, C. E. (ed.), The Letters of John Dryden 200.
- Ward, W. S., Byron's *Hours of Idleness* and Other than Scotch Reviewers 547, Shelley and the Reviewers Once More 539.
- Weatherly, E. H., Beau Tibbs and Colonel Sellers 310.
- Webb, H. J., Chaucer's Knight and the Hundred Years' War 45; Falstaff's Clothes 162.
- Wells, S. B. (ed.), A Comparison between the Two Stages: A Late Restoration Book of the Theatre 219.
- Whitfield, J. H., Petrarch and the Renaissance 574.
- Wieruszowski, H., The Rise of the Catalan Language in the 13th Century 9.
- Wiley, B., The Seventeenth Century Background 437.
- Williams, C. O., Thralldom in Ancient Iceland 507.
- Wilson, G. D. (ed.), *The Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey Chaucer 217.
- Wolfe, D M., Milton in the Puritan Revolution 142.
- Wright, L. B., Religion and Empire 356.
- Zeydel, E. H., Knowledge of Hrotsvitha's Works Prior to 1500 382.

REVIEWERS

- Allen, D C · D Bush (ed), Selected Poems of Sir William Davenant 220, L Cooper, Experiments in Education 220, B Willey, The Seventeenth Century Background 437
- Bald, R C M J Quinlan, Victorian Prelude 71
- Bennett, J W C G Osgood (ed), The Works of Edmund Spenser 336
- Bernbaum, E B H Bronson and Others, Studies in the Comic 215, G H Gerould, The Patterns of English and American Fiction 364, P B Gove, The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction 137, F M A Hilbish, Charlotte Smith 137, W R Irwin, The Making of "Jonathan Wild" 137, G H Maynardier, The First American Novelist? 137
- Blanchard, R J R Moore, Defoe's Sources for *Robert Drury's Journal* 200, C E Ward (ed), The Letters of John Dryden 200
- Booth, B A F H Lyell, A Study of the Novels of John Galt 145.
- Botting, R B R E Bennett (ed), The Complete Poems of John Donne 141, W Frost, Fulke Greville's *Caelica* 218, B. Penrose, Urbane Travelers, 1591-1635 218
- Bredvold, L I J Butt and G Tilotson (eds.), The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope 202, E N. Hooker (ed), The Critical Works of John Dennis 354.
- Brown, D. F J J Arrom, Historia de la literatura dramática cubana 432
- Bush, D. J Q. Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris* by T H (1594) 214
- Caplan, H.. Sister M C O'Connor, The Art of Dying Well 191.
- Clifford, J L A C. Ward, A Literary Journey through Wartime Britain 511
- Cooley, F D · W D Paden, Tennyson in Egypt 362
- Craig, H. T W Baldwin, William Shakespeare's Petty School 133, M M. Bhattacharje, "Courtesy" in Shakespeare 133, O J Campbell, Shakespeare's Satire 133, T M Parrott and R H Ball, A Short View of Elizabethan Drama 133
- Curry, K H W Howe, Greta Hall 436
- Daiches, D · R T Fitzhugh and D Ferguson (eds), Robert Burns 581
- Dunn, W H H B Hagstotz, The Educational Theories of John Ruskin 216
- Einarsson, S. E Haugen, Norwegian Word Studies 61, J S Kenyon and T A Knott, A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English 575
- Everett, E M W Staebler, The Liberal Mind of John Morley 435
- Fagin, N. B. G C D Odell, Annals of the New York Stage, XIII (1885-1888) 219
- Frank, G G Cohen, La Grande Clarté du Moyen-Age 583
- Furness, C J. H I'A Fausset, Walt Whitman 64
- Gee, J. A T C Izard, George Whetstone 143
- Graham, W R Blanchard (ed), The Correspondence of Richard Steele 69
- Greene, R L K C Balderston (ed), Thraliana 67
- Hatcher, A G.. R E Clark and L Poston, Jr, French Syntax List 502.
- Havens, R D R W Chapman (ed), Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, XXVIII 295
- Hollander, L M · H Hermannsson, Bibliographic Notes 430; C. O. Williams, Thraldom in Ancient Iceland 507
- Irving, W. H: R. A Aubin (ed), London in Flames, London in Glory 206, L. C Jones, The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes 148.

- Jente, R. V. E. Hull and A. Taylor, *A Collection of Welsh Riddles* 213
- Johnson, F. R. J. C. Adams, *The Globe Playhouse* 198; K. R. Wallace, *Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric* 505
- Jones, C. E. L. L. Martz, *The Later Career of Tobias Smollett* 208
- Jones, P. F. L. R. Lund (ed.), *The Vita Sancti Malchi of Reginald of Canterbury* 292
- Jones, W. P. H. W. Stair, *Gray as a Literary Critic* 146
- Kelley, M. M. M. Ross, *Milton's Royalism* 578
- Kelso, R.: J. Robertson, *The Art of Letter Writing* 203
- Kirschbaum, L. A. Hart, *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies* 196
- Knickerbocker, W. S. F. A. von Hayek (ed.), *The Spirit of the Age* by J. S. Mill 210
- Koller, K.: A. Esdaile (ed.), *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* 428; E. J. Howard (ed.), *Pleasant Quipses for Upstart Newfangled Gentlewomen* 428; W. Ringler, *Stephen Gosson* 427
- Lancaster, H. C.: F. Cailliet, *The Clue to Pascal* 438; *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 510; G. Cohen (ed.), *Geoffroy Tory and Catherine de Medici* 218; G. R. Kernodle, *From Art to Theatre* 572.
- Lange, V.: J. Boyd, *Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris* 209
- Lattimore, R.: L. Cooper (tr.), *Plato on the Trial and Death of Socrates* 215.
- Lipari, A.: E. Detti, *Margaret Fuller Ossoli* 361.
- Loomis, C. G.: G. E. Moore, *The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor* 193.
- Lowry, H. F. T. H. V. Motter, *The Writings of Arthur Hallam* 426
- Mackenzie, W. R.: G. P. Jackson, *Down-East Spirituals and Others* 365
- McNamara, K.: I. W. U. Chase (ed.), *Horace Walpole. Gardener* 579.
- Magoun, F. P., Jr.: E. V. K. Dobbie (ed.), *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems* 497.
- Malone, K.: Caroline Brady, *The Legends of Eriuanian* 183; C. W. Kennedy, *The Earliest English Poetry* 191
- Manning, C. A. E. J. Simmons, *An Outline of Modern Russian Literature (1880-1910)* 366
- Martin, W. E., Jr.: E. Merchand, *Frank Norris, a Study* 134
- Mezger, F.: H. M. Smyser and F. P. Magoun, Jr. (trs.), *Survivals in Old Norwegian of Medieval English, French and German Literature* 147
- Minei, L. M. L. Howard, *The Connecticut Wits* 359
- Mossner, E. C.: C. F. Harrold (ed.), *A Newman Treasury* 437.
- Nethercot, A. H.: A. Bonjour, *Coleridge's 'Hymn before Sunrise'* 358.
- Niess, R. J.: A. J. Salvan, *Zola aux États-Unis* 431
- Notestein, W. D. M. Wolfe, *Milton in the Puritan Revolution* 112.
- Painter, S.: M. D. Legge (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions from All Souls Ms. 182-70*
- Parker, W. R.: R. W. Chambers, *Poets and Their Critics: Langland and Milton* 205; C. S. Lewis, *A Preface to Paradise Lost* 265.
- Patch, H. R.: E. J. Howard and G. D. Wilson (eds.), *The Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey Chaucer 217; R. B. McJimsey, *Chaucer's Irregular -W* 188.
- Peyre, H.: A. Schaffer, *The Genres of Parnassian Poetry* 420
- Pottle, F. A.: J. C. Corson, *A Bibliography of Sir Walter Scott* 580; E. C. Mossner, *The Forgotten Hume* 294.
- Quintana, R.: H. N. Faichild, *Religious Trends in English Poetry* 290.
- Sams, H. W.: L. B. Wright, *Religion and Empire* 356
- Savage, H.: Sir I. Gollancz (ed.), *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 342.
- Selmer, C.: J. A. Hiller, *Albrecht von Eyb, Medieval Moralist* 509; Sister M. J. Schroeder, *Mary-Verse in Meistersang* 367; S. L. Sum-

- beig, The Nuremberg Schembart
 Carnival 508
 Shaaber, M. A W W Greg, The
 Editorial Problem in Shakespeare
 139
 Shafer, R. W V Moody, R M
 Lovett, F B Millett, A History
 of English Literature 287, G
 Sampson, The Concise Cambridge
 History of English Literature 350,
 E Wagenknecht, Cavalcade of the
 English Novel 287
 Singleton, C S G Grillo, Poets at
 the Court of Ferrara 584, J H
 Whitfield, Petrarch and the Re-
 naissance 574
 Smith, R M R K Alspach, Irish
 Poetry from the English Invasion
 to 1798 422
 Spencer, H S B Wells (ed.), A
 Comparison between the Two
 Stages. A Late Restoration Book
 of the Theatre 219
 Stern, B H S A Larrabee, Eng-
 lish Bards and Grecian Marbles
 211
 Watkins, W B C · L Hartley, This
 is Lorence 363
 Williams, S T · E Detti, Margaret
 Fuller Ossoli 361
 Wolf, J Q, Jr G W Meyer,
 Wordsworth's Formative Years
 424